THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 3. JUNE 1929. Vol. XIX.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Dr. David and the 'Church Times.'

The May issue of *The Liverpool Review* contains a strong but temperate article on the *Church Times* by the Bishop of the diocese.

> 'This journal,' writes Dr. David, 'is very ably edited. It has a large circulation and is read by many who, while in general sympathy with the cause it advocates, that of Anglo-Catholicism, are often distressed by the spirit and temper with which it appears to identify that cause, by its policy and methods in advancing it, and especially by its attitude towards other schools of thought within the Church. Nevertheless they go on reading it, partly because it contains from time to time matter of real Christian value, and partly because they find in it a spice of excitement and amusement. They are so well accustomed to its lapses from the Christian spirit that they commonly pass them over with a tolerant shrug. Yet the matter is too serious for such light treatment. To attack, to decry, to condemn, can easily be made amusing. But it is worth while for the directing authority of this paper to consider the spiritual mischief wrought by weekly doses of petty partizanship and sharp uncharitableness. Anyhow, the time has come when something of what many of its readers have for long been saying to each other should be openly expressed.'

For ourselves, we regularly read the *Church Times* for the simple reason that it amuses us; compared with our leading Church weekly, *Punch* is a dull paper. Nevertheless, we agree with the Bishop that it is a poor guide if taken seriously. 'An enquirer into the religious life of the country who should study it in this the most widely read of the Anglican weeklies,' would acquire certain misleading impressions, *e.g.* 'that the advance of our Christianity is to be measured by the number of churches

where vestments are used, and of bishops who wear mitres,' and so on. And those who fall short in these respects would certainly be regarded as the main obstacles to religious progress:

> 'As to any whose approach to God does not involve externals of this kind, they are to be opposed and derided, their work belittled, and their weaknesses smartly, slightingly, and often jeeringly exposed.'

There can be little doubt that the activities which centre in Liverpool Cathedral are a special object of dislike to our esteemed contemporary, which doubtless sees in them an exemplar of the type of Christianity which is destined to supplant its own. For the fact is that Liverpool is more closely in touch with Catholicism than is London. In the Roman Catholic metropolitan area of Liverpool are two-fifths of the Roman Catholics of England, mostly of Irish extraction; so that, in this region, if people want Catholicism, they know where they can get it. The more or less counterfeit article offered by Anglo-Catholics may satisfy South Coast *rentiers* or the inhabitants of Whitechapel, but Lancashire has a more acute sense of reality. Everyone knows that Anglo-Catholicism has been dependent for prosperity and progress hitherto upon a succession of well-to-do and personally attractive bachelor priests. Prebendary Mackay let us into the secret a year or so ago in his charming and delightful book *Saints and Leaders*. For example, Charles Lowder was the son of a well-to-do banker of Bath, and 'had tremendous spirits, charming manners, was extremely good-looking, and was very popular.' Dolling's father 'had considerable estates in the North of Ireland,' and was educated at Harrow. King was the son of an Archdeacon in days when it was worth while to be one. Arthur Stanton at Rugby was 'the best-looking boy in the school,' and came of a well-to-do Gloucestershire family. Richard Benson, founder of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, was 'the son of wealthy parents.' Of this type, Bishop Gore and Dr. Winnington Ingram are the only survivors.

Dr. David more especially deplores the attitude of our contemporary towards Reunion, the present movement towards which it condemns beforehand as a 'Lambeth plot,' thus creating prejudice by an insinuating phrase 'which may be good journalism, but certainly indicates very bad Christianity.' Recent co-operation and mutual tolerance among men of differ-

nt views in the Church have made it possible to realize how uch real unity of spirit prevails amongst them :

> 'They have discovered that by study and prayer together, men of very different religious traditions and temperaments gain a new understanding and appreciation of those traditions, and what is still more important, a new understanding of one another.'

Moreover the Bishop, who takes wider views than those of partizan fanatic, realizes what immense tasks await a Church urged of disunion :

> 'Faced by the overwhelming demand of the World Call upon the Church, they are bitterly aware that our dissensions at home are the main cause of our impotence to make our answer to it. New power sufficient for new work awaits us. But only in a ministry of living brotherhood can we receive it.'

And yet, though the need is so great and the situation in ome ways so promising, 'Into this growing harmony of thought nd service is distilled every Friday the gall of bitterness.' hings might be so different :

> 'This journal could yet be a mighty power for good if it were directed in an unmistakably Christian spirit; condemning and excluding all that transgresses the fundamental law of Christian love; looking for the best in every contribution of life and labour to the thought and work of the Church; gently and reasonably correcting what is well meant but wrong-headed; faithful to its chosen cause yet always, and, especially when the great issues confront us, standing for the Catholic view, which sees over against them, not a single group in the manifold membership of the Church, but the Body of Christ, whole and one.'

One hopes that this article will gain the attention of that ery large body of more or less old-fashioned Anglo-Catholics vho look with misgiving upon the ginger group of their own arty, and are wondering whether the sectarian bitterness of heir popular weekly is likely to do their cause any good. erhaps they will seek to bring pressure to bear upon those esponsible.

For ourselves, we shall not commit the indecency of preaching to the *Church Times*, which, as we hinted above, is a paper vhich, if it suffered a reformation of manners, would lose much f its charm in our eyes.

AN UNCALLED-FOR ATTACK.

In the May issue of *The Bishoprick*, his diocesan monthly, Dr. Henson chastises Dr. Major, who was formerly his examining chaplain. Whether it be that the chaplain has become more

radical, or the bishop more conservative, we cannot say; bu the result lies before us. The immediate cause of the Bishop's righteous indignation is the book (reviewed in our Februar issue), *Modern Problems of the Church*, 'which discloses an attitude towards the Church so supercilious and belittling as to move the question whether its author does not regard the Church as rather the enemy than the ordained exponent of Christianity.. We read also that:

> 'Dr. Major's view of the Church appears to me too discordant with the teaching of the New Testament, too inconsistent with the history of Christianity, and too incompatible with the spiritual interest of individual Christians to be seriously maintained. It is, moreover, too vague, and even incoherent to be practically serviceable. Indeed, his sharply-accentuated distinction between the Christain Faith and the Catholic Church appears to me unsound, and it goes far to vitiate his whole treatment of the "modern problems of the Church."'

Has it occurred to Dr. Henson that the separation (or shall we call it *distinction*?) complained of may have been made in the interests of the Christian Faith itself? And if, as a matter of historical fact, the separation or distinction is impossible (here Dr. Henson has the authority of Loisy and Kirsopp Lake to support him) does this make the position of Christianity more secure?

Dr. Henson passes on to observe that

> 'Dr. Major's discussion of 'the Problem of Ministry' seems to me to reflect that remoteness from real life which too often marks and mars academic discussions of practical questions. He says, of course, many true things, but the point of view from which he regards the work of a parish clergyman seems to me wrong, and the picture of parochial requirements which he appears to contemplate has slight relation to fact. He allows himself to speak contemptuously of some familiar features of parochial ministry which merit more respect. The young clergyman who is too superior and "intellectually gifted" to stand in frankly with all the multifarious activities which grow of pastoral experience, even though they belong to the "social and re-creational" side of parish life, will assuredly fail to win the confidence and affection of the people. They may be trusted not to disturb his learned leisure.'

We had looked to Dr. Henson for remarks of greater originality. It is easy, and has now become tedious, to poke fun at the earnest ordinand who credits (*o sancta simplicitas!*) the existence of a large body of intelligent laity within the Church of England thirsting for a Modernist gospel. The majority of church-goers in the average parish, of course, desire no such thing—for the intelligent and religious people are too often to

be found outside, not inside, the Church. And in point of fact it will be found that most young clergymen of Modernist views loyally and gladly take their share, and more than their share, in the 'multifarious activities' to which Dr. Henson, like other high-placed dignitaries who are exempted from them, attaches such importance.

Dr. Henson also finds his ex-chaplain unsound on the question of history and Christianity. He observes that

> 'Dr. Major insists that even the historical existence of Jesus is not essential to Christianity. The Incarnation, Atonement and Resurrection may all, he holds, be believed without believing in an historical Jesus. His view that even the very existence of Jesus is optional is, of course, totally incompatible with Apostolic Christianity.'

Anyone who knows Dr. Major and his writings is aware that on this historical question he personally takes a highly conservative standpoint. The offending passage, to which the Bishop gives the reference (*Modern Churchman*, October, 1928, p. 285), is by way of a concession to the anti-historical school. 'I will not argue that point now,' says Dr. Major, 'but there is something to be said for it.'

There is, indeed, a very great deal to be said for it, in spite of Dr. Henson's *pronunciamento*.

However, we would not have troubled our readers with the business at all — which we fear has been as tedious to them as to us — but for the fact that Dr. Henson's latest *rôle* — that of ecclesiastical disciplinarian—makes his *ex cathedra* utterances worthy of our closest attention. It will not have been forgotten that the sacred cause of Disestablishment-for-the-Sake-of-Discipline has recently gained a new adherent in the Bishop of Durham. Dr. Henson, it is true, has his censorious eye more especially upon the recalcitrant Anglo-Romans; but what is sauce for the goose also serves for the gander, and those Modernists whose views pass beyond limits laid down by episcopal decree may find themselves in trouble. Dr. Henson is out to regiment us.

Trying it On.

Everyone was aware that when the solution of the Irish Question had liberated Catholic energies for political mischief we should witness a revival of intrigue and agitation. The

Roman Catholic hierarchy has begun its campaign by issuing a *questionnaire* to certain Parliamentary candidates on the subject of Catholic schools, according to the results of which the faithful will be instructed to vote. As the Catholic vote in certain constituencies (especially in Lancashire) is a possibly decisive factor, some candidates have been rash or prudent enough to make promises which afterwards, perhaps, they will see cause to regret. Dr. Somers, a distinguished Roman Catholic, ventured, in a letter to the *Manchester Guardian*, to criticize the episcopal policy, and called down upon his head the epistolary fury of his co-religionists. But if there are liberals among Catholics who will be offended, there are many more amongst other Nonconformists who will resent bitterly this introduction of continental methods into English politics. As Principal Townsend has put it in a letter to the same journal:

> 'It is clear that there are Liberals in the Roman Church who resent the reintroduction of the mediaeval political methods of the Roman priesthood. When many more Roman Catholics who are liberal-minded, and who understand the psychology of the British nation, realise what is happening, we believe that they will begin to teach the hierarchy in England that Englishmen are not going to have their politics dictated from Rome. That policy cost Romanism dearly in the sixteenth century, and it will prove ruinous in the twentieth century. We appeal to liberal-minded people in the Roman Church to realise the serious nature of the attempt to influence British politics through a foreign authority. It can only light again the fires of religious controversy and as far as education is concerned the children of the nation will be the chief sufferers. The Roman demand violates the fundamental principle of Liberalism, which is that public control must accompany the use of public money.'

'Suffer the little children,' said Jesus. The priests have taken Him at His word, and over the souls of children they will wage a virulent and irreconcilable warfare, knowing full well that weeds of superstition must be planted early if they are to make a luxuriant growth.

Free-Church Modernism.

An appeal that the beliefs of a superannuated theology should be discarded was made by the Rev. T. Rhondda Williams in his address from the chair at the ninety-seventh annual assembly of the Congregational Union, held in the City Temple on May 7th. His address, 'Christian Belief in the

Modern World,' contained some utterances of a remarkably outspoken character:

> 'We have got to realise,' said Mr. Williams, 'that our traditional doctrines concerning Jesus, hammered out as they were in the early councils of the Church, cannot be made current coin in the intellectual world of to-day. . .
>
> 'I believe that the present crisis in religion is due in part to the fact that thinking in conection with religion has never been thorough enough since the days of the Reformation. It is due to the further fact that even the best thinking which has been done has not been consistently recognised in the services of the Church. . .
>
> 'The framework of the old theology has gone to pieces. I feel quite sure that, whatever the religion of the future will be, it will not be traditional Christianity. Indeed, traditional Christianity has already ceased to be the religion of a good many of our churches and of a still larger number of our ministers. But the thing has not been plainly said and acknowledged, and our services have not been recast fully in the light of that fact. . .
>
> 'It is the misfortune of the Church that the creeds which still hold a formal place in most of them are for a greater part impossible of belief to educated and intellectual men and women. The pulpit is suspected of trimming and prevarication and of something very near to, if not quite, intellectual dishonesty. Men to-day want their religious teaching to be above-board as their scientific teaching is. . .
>
> 'I think the Church has a great deal to learn from scientists in regard to reverence for truth. In Church thinking and speaking there is far too much prudence, tactical care and worldly wisdom; too much playing for safety—these things have too often strangled the witness of the Church to truth. "Safety First" is a good motto for motorists, but it is the damnation of the Christian ministry.'

This is clear, straight, forcible stuff, such as we should like to hear from a bishop addressing a Diocesan Conference. It is, more or less, what has been reiterated only too often in the pages of the *Modern Churchman*. If this is the spirit which animates any large section of the Free Churches, reunion with them will not create a Fundamentalist *bloc* firmly pledged to resist theological innovations.

A Plea for the Under-Dog.

We do not find ourselves invariably in agreement with the publications of The Faith Press, Limited, but their latest volume, *Voces Clamantium* (2/6), edited by Mr. Chalmers Bell, merits a cordial welcome from all who view with misgivings the detrition of the parochial clergyman between the upper and nether millstones of bureaucratic tyranny and ignorant lay dic-

tation. The Introductory Essay by Mr. C. B. Mortlock subjects the Church Assembly and its works to scathing criticism:

> 'Within the short space of time during which the Assembly has been in existence, the clergy have been the objects of legislative enactments that have already robbed them of much of their independence, and they are threatened with a great deal more.' '

Mr. Mortlock shows that the foundation of our liberties is the parson's freehold, and it is upon this that our bureaucrats are laying their hands. What the parochial clergy find symbolized in their freehold is 'freedom of spiritual opportunity in a position of spiritual responsibility which cannot be shared.' If this is to be swept away, it should not be done under pretext of improving the existing order.

> 'Against the abuse of the parson's freehold, of which we hear a good deal, should be set the strength which comes to the parson from a sense of absolute security. He is the envied of all his schismatic competitors. He is not, on the one hand, the creature of the bishop to be sent packing at the shortest notice. Nor, on the other hand, has he the chapel deacons as his masters. He is still free to teach the faith and order the worship of the people committed to his care without needing to keep a furtive eye for ever roaming above and below.'

Mr. Mortlock summarizes his charges in the following trenchant passage:

> 'There is no mistaking the desire behind all these enactments. It is to gather more and more power into the hands of the central authority, and to sap the independence of the parish priest, so that he will become a salaried agent, regimented and controlled, and without effectual power of resistence.'

Mr. Chalmers Bell himself contributes a chapter on Clerical Poverty, and points out, what every country clergyman knows better than most bishops, that the basis of population is a ridiculous one upon which to calculate income — £400 a year may be poverty in the country, whereas in the town (with a generous congregation) it may be a possible income. Mr. Bell rightly says that the clergy, especially in the country, should be provided with an entirely different class of dwelling. Yet often difficulties are put in the way of incumbents desirous of disposing of impossible houses, and bishops counsel patience.

> An average vicarage consists of three living rooms and six bedrooms, and, in the country, from a half to three-quarters of an acre of garden. An establishment of this kind would not be looked at by a layman unless he were prepared to spend at least double the £400 of the clergyman and probably more.'

We should welcome a volume on this subject by some clergyman's wife; but most of them are too busy or too tired:

> 'The wife becomes a domestic drudge . . . No woman, however willing and energetic, can do single-handed the work of a house of the kind described above and keep it as it ought to be kept. The most she can do is to manage it for a limited period at a certain sacrifice of health. The unkept gardens, the grubby and comfortless houses, tell their own tale.'

The only safe and sure remedy that we can see for clerical poverty is (as has been suggested) to add another Question and Answer to the Form and Manner of Making Deacons, as follows:

The Bishop. 'Will you apply all your diligence to secure unto yourself an helpmeet possessing ample store of worldly goods sufficient both for herself and for thee?'

Answer. 'I will endeavour myself so to do, the Lord being my helper.'

THE NON-GRADUATE ORDINAND

By the Rev. J. F. Clayton, M.A., Tutor of Salisbury and Warminster Theological Colleges.

IN the general criticism now poured upon the Church of England, the Theological Colleges, especially those which accept non-graduates, seem to be the objects of particular censure. This continual criticism has aroused widespread suspicion among churchpeople who have no means of finding out the facts for themselves; and as suspicion is especially mischievous when it is based upon ignorance, it may be well for one who has had considerable experience of such institutions to accept the kind invitation of the Editor of this magazine to write an article on 'The Non-Graduate Ordinand.'

This subject excludes any mention of those theological colleges which only accept graduates, namely, Wells; Cuddesdon, Wycliffe Hall, and Ripon Hall in or near Oxford; Ely, Ridley Hall and Westcott House in or near Cambridge. It also excludes those where a University degree course is part of the training offered, namely, Mirfield and the two colleges of St. John and St. Chad attached to the University of Durham. It must not, however, be inferred that these colleges are untouched by the criticisms levelled at the 'non-graduate colleges.'

This last term, it should be noted, is often a misnomer, as most of the colleges so described have some students who either have taken or are taking a University degree.

This article will describe the training given to a non-graduate ordinand and then try to answer some of the criticisms made against that training.

I.

Non-graduate ordinands are divided into two groups:

(*a*) Older men with a long experience of professional work.

(*b*) Men of the usual age of University students.

(*a*) The older candidates. It is impossible to have any uniform course of training, as each application is considered on its own merits. As a rule, if a bishop is satisfied that such a man is fitted for the ministry, he requires him to reside for at least a year at some theological college and to pass such examination as may be appointed. As it is sometimes supposed that such middle-aged candidates are the best material for the ministry, it may not be out of place to state that, while men with an honourable record of professional work often supply some of the ablest of our parochial clergy, it does not necessarily follow that because a man has done well in some lay profession he is therefore suited to the work of a clergyman; and sometimes a short residence at a theological college has saved him from a serious mistake.

(*b*) The majority of non-graduate candidates belong to the other group, those of the usual age of students. For such young men two courses are possible, which may be termed 'External' and 'Internal.'

The 'External' course is that suggested by a bishop in a northern diocese who has had a long experience of training ordinands. The scheme is as follows:

If a boy of 18 or thereabouts expresses a desire for ordination, he is to be encouraged to work in his spare time for a matriculation examination; the effort required will in itself be some test of his character and ability. When he has passed this examination the diocese to which he belongs will recognize him as a candidate for ordination to the extent of providing him with courses of lectures on the Bible, Doctrine, Church History

and Worship; he will attend these classes in his spare time, and he will continue to earn his living as before. Probably each of these four subjects will require a year's work, and at the end of each course there will be an examination. If the candidate passes in every subject, and if his record is in other respects satisfactory, he may then be advised to give up the work at which he has hitherto earned his living and to go to some college for a year; if he cannot afford the money, then at this point (and not before) the diocese will offer help.

It is claimed that such a scheme would weed out candidates who are lacking either in perseverance or in brain-power; that it would cost the Church very little; that the candidate would have the satisfaction of going through the whole of his training, except for the final year, without financial assistance; and that any grant given during this final year might fairly be regarded as a well-earned scholarship.

This scheme was formulated some years ago; it is probably too early to pronounce on its success or failure, but it is worth mentioning to any suitable man who desires to be ordained and does not wish to spend several years at a theological college at the expense of the Church.

The course usually followed is that described as 'Internal'; that is to say, the candidate goes to some theological college which accepts men who do not possess a University degree. The list of such colleges includes (among others) King's College (London), Salisbury, Lincoln, Lichfield, Chichester, Birkenhead, Highbury, Kelham, and the Missionary Colleges at Canterbury, Warminster, Dorchester and Burgh.

Of these colleges Kelham stands by itself; the college is managed by the Society of the Sacred Mission; the course includes a long training both in Arts and in Theology, and the discipline is so severe as to reject any candidate who is weak in character or incapable of functioning as a Christian teacher. Probably Kelham is the most effective instrument that the Church of England possesses for 'combing out' the unattractive pious youth whose ideas of the ministry are limited to the ornaments of the altar and the vestments of the sacristy. The type of Anglicanism produced at Kelham probably inclines to the Catholic rather than to the Protestant side of the Established

Church, but no one without gross unfairness can accuse this college of producing the ignorant, dogmatic, and often ill-mannered type of 'seminarist' whom the English layman so rightly dislikes.

The other colleges mentioned, though varying in their types of Anglican teaching, are alike in that they all have to fall in with the requirements of the official body known as 'The Central Advisory Council for the Training of the Ministry.' This body requires that the course of theological instruction for non-graduates shall last three years; that it cannot begin until the candidate has passed a matriculation examination; that the lectures must follow the syllabus of the General Ordination Examination, which is conducted by examiners appointed by the Council and is normally required by the bishops as a preliminary to ordination. Further, no college is recognized by that Council unless it submits to a periodic inspection conducted by educational experts, possibly laymen, who are unconnected with that particular college.

Some of the colleges named allow candidates to reside before passing matriculation, and to work for this preliminary examination in a sort of 'junior school.' This plan, however, is open to serious criticism, and some at least of these colleges refuse to accept any candidate until he is ready to begin the three years' course in Theology.

The syllabus of the General Ordination Examination includes the Bible, Doctrine, Church History, Christian Ethics, Worship. A glance at the papers set in any term will show that a candidate has to know the facts of Biblical criticism and Church History, though, as the Council respects the liberty of the individual to follow his own judgment, he is not forced to accept the critical (or any other) view as his own.

Besides these examination subjects, the candidate also receives some training in the practical work of a clergyman, such as preaching, teaching, visiting; at one of the colleges with which the writer of this article is connected this part of the training includes religious teaching in an elementary school under the supervision of an expert educationalist; the preparation of sermons under the guidance of the Principal; and the care of a mission district involving one afternoon's visiting every week as well as a Sunday evening service.

A minister is not only a teacher and a pastor; he is also a leader in worship, and for this purpose his own devotional life must be trained, and a theological college (graduate or otherwise) has to teach its members to form habits of prayer as well as to get a grasp of sound theology. The method varies in different colleges, but even where the list of services seems excessive to a lay observer considerable freedom is left to the individual student; thus some colleges maintain a daily celebration of Holy Communion, but each student may choose for himself how far he will avail himself of such services. Lastly, at all the colleges mentioned the students live in common, and the discipline of collegiate life affords some test of a man's character, a test that seems to be wanting in colleges which are not residential.

At the end of the three years, if he has passed the General Ordination Examination and is in other respects satisfactory, the student is recommended for admission to the diaconate. His training is by no means complete, and the two years in his first curacy are as important as the period spent at the theological college; hence the utmost care is needed in placing him where the work is suited to his capacity and the incumbent is capable of training a deacon. A wise ordinand will consult the Principal of his college about the scene of his first ministry; no doubt many wrong steps have been taken at this point, even in colleges where the Principal is noted for his success in placing his students; but some at least of the 'misfits' are due to the student having insisted on going to some parish without, or even against, the advice of the authorities of his college.

This account is based on the writer's experience as a lecturer at two colleges, one of them a Missionary College; but probably the main points in this statement apply to any college recognized by the Central Advisory Council.

II.

It remains to consider the criticisms made against these colleges. The most serious seem to be these:

(*a*) The intellectual training is inadequate.

(*b*) The system produces narrow enthusiasts and aggressive partisans.

(*c*) The students are financed by the Church.

(*d*) Church money is used for Anglo-Catholic propaganda and so to revolutionize the Established Church from within.

(*e*) Financial pressure is used to produce what some ecclesiastical party regards as 'orthodoxy.'

(*a*) The intellectual training is said to be inadequate.

No one claims that it is perfect, but the non-graduate and the graduate colleges have to consider other students besides those capable of taking first or second class honours at a University. Probably the demand made on the non-graduate by the General Ordination Examination is heavier than that made upon a graduate candidate twenty years ago. The writer of this article was ordained in 1908 after a very happy year at a graduate theological college; here the lectures were arranged to meet the requirements of the various 'Bishop's Examinations,' and in that for which he presented himself Christian Ethics was entirely omitted, and the Church History ended at the year 1603; to-day the General Ordination Examination includes Christian Ethics, and the Church History paper includes questions on the whole development of organized Christianity from the beginning until the present day. Such a comparison suggests that a non-graduate who has passed the General Ordination Examination with some credit may be a better educated man than a graduate with a pass degree who, after a year at a theological college, managed to scrape through the examination of a lenient bishop.

(*b*) The system is said to produce partisans.

No doubt a theological college does have its own point of view, whether Anglo-Catholic like Ely, Evangelical like Ridley Hall, or Broad Church like Ripon Hall; these happen to be graduate colleges, but the same remark applies to the others. Yet in those colleges with which the writer is acquainted Evangelicals of the liberal sort, and non-party Churchmen, have managed to be happy as well as those who would have described themselves as High Churchmen. If some products of these colleges have annoyed the laity by their intolerant enthusiasm

their aggressive partisanship, the truth is likely to be that ey were partisans when they entered the college and that roughout their course they resisted every effort of the staff to ersuade them to take a wider view.

Of course, the criticism that a college is partisan may only ean that it does not support the critic's own party, but such a ishonest charge will not be brought by anyone who can fairly aim to be 'liberal' in his Churchmanship.

) It is objected that most of the candidates are subsidised.

Probably a large proportion of ordinands, whether at a Uni- ersity or at a Theological College, are receiving some financial elp either by an open or close scholarship or by means of a rant from some diocesan fund or from some religious society. is difficult, however, to see why such educational grants ould be withheld only from men who are training for the inistry. No doubt such grants are sometimes made to the rong men, but the same risk has to be taken in the award of cholarships and bursaries quite independent of those adminis- ered for Church purposes.

) It is thought that Church money is used for the propagation of Anglo-Catholicism.

By the phrase 'Church money' is presumably meant funds at are administered by a central body or a diocesan board of nance, and subscribed by Church members of whom many have strong objection to Anglo-Catholicism. If the critic will study e report of any diocesan board of finance he will probably find at that board makes grants towards the training of perhaps a ozen candidates, and that these are distributed over colleges epresenting every variety of Anglicanism; unless the critic eans that Anglo-Catholicism has no right to exist within our omprehensive National Church, it seems impossible to justify e charge that Church money is being used to forward a plot r de-protestantizing the Church of England. It should per- aps be added that 'Broad Churchmanship,' while it resists any aim on the part of Anglo-Catholics to dominate the Estab- shed Church and to exclude others, cannot consistently deny em a place in that Church provided that they keep its rules.

(*e*) It is suggested that the financial pull is used to enforce what some theological party describes as 'orthodox.'

This charge may mean three things:

(1) That the candidate is pressed by the college authorities.

(2) That the candidate is pressed by some outside society.

(3) That the college is pressed by that outside society.

As to the first suggestion, the writer knows of no instance of such tyranny, and the burden of proof lies with those who have such suspicions.

As to the second suggestion, if a party society likes to use the funds subscribed by its own members for the propagating of its own views, it has a right to do what it will with its own. There may be overwhelming reasons why a candidate should not pledge himself to a theological party while his own views are yet unformed, but if a youth is rash enough to accept a grant on condition of joining an ecclesiastical party he cannot complain if on his leaving that party the grant is withdrawn.

As to the remaining suggestion, no self-respecting Principal of any Theological College would allow the teaching at his college to be dictated by an outside society of any kind; and if such a society threatened to withdraw its candidates he would probably prefer to see them depart rather than put himself and his college into theological bondage.

In conclusion, the writer desires to make three observations of a more general character.

1. There is a difference between a non-graduate clergyman and a non-educated clergyman. The ministry ought not to be open to the uneducated, but the education necessary for an efficient minister does not necessarily depend on a University degree. A man who has spent several years in business, has qualified himself for matriculation and then passed the General Ordination Examination, may be a better-informed candidate than one whose knowledge of life is limited to a University and a Theological College. In these days when the new universities offer an opportunity of a degree to many who would have been debarred from it a generation ago, every effort should be made

to secure a graduate clergy wherever possible; but to suppose that education is tied to a degree is to exhibit an intellectual snobbishness as unpleasant as the snobbishness based on wealth or social position, or even on ecclesiastical orthodoxy.

2. Theological colleges, like most colleges at our Universities, have their ups and downs. If we had to advise a candidate in his choice of a college, whether graduate or non-graduate, there are some that we should suggest in preference to others; and at the best of colleges there are likely to be some men whose ordination we view with regret. The same fact applies to the Universities and their colleges, but we do not therefore make ourselves ridiculous by trying to cover the Universities with contempt.

3. If the best men are to be attracted to the ministry, the Church should make the position of a parochial clergyman more suitable for a man of character and ability; and the Church includes the laity as well as the clergy. The scope of this paper rules out the mention of such deterrents as financial burdens or insufficient work, or the criticism poured by many of the laity on a clergyman who refuses to devote his life to the unclerical tasks of organizing entertainments and raising money. It does not exclude the mention of a still more serious blot on the Church of England to-day, namely, its incessant quarrels; and under this count of the indictment must be included the contemptuous, unfair, and often very ignorant criticism of the non-graduate clergy and their training. A minister expects opposition from those who reject Christianity altogether, nor is he surprised at receiving contempt from some enthusiastic Christians who object to anything like a 'Church.' But the most cutting criticisms often come from those who call themselves Churchmen, and even 'Broad Churchmen,' and no man is likely to be attracted to a ministry if he is to be an object of contempt to those to whom he ministers.

THE RELIGIOUS OUTLOOK OF THE WORKING CLASSES

By the Rev. S. Proudfoot, formerly editor of *The Optimist.*

IT will readily occur to all readers that a subject so vast and so intangible demands that the writer should limit his enquiry to the concrete facts, and rein in his imagination when reasoning upon them. Mere impressions may be very misleading, for generally one sees only that which the eye has been trained to see, and we know that in all of us that training has been inadequate. To escape from these pitfalls that which follows comprises my own actual recorded experience within the five churches in which I have ministered for periods of 8, 4, 3, 9 and 8 years respectively; and includes figures carefully and comprehensively compiled from an investigation conducted in a typical Northern industrial city. The census was based on definite principles, and in thoroughly representative areas, that is to say touching all the known grades within the artizan sphere, from the slum, throughout all ascending grades, to those touching on the middle class. I drew up a questionnaire, and had it reliably dealt with by tactful and sympathetic inquirers, who *saw*, personally, those to whom the questions were put. They inform me there was no reluctance shewn in answering the questions, and not the least sign in any of them that it was an invasion either of their privacy or liberty. In many cases the replies were given with an air of complete indifference to religious institutions, and with the pointed suggestion that the whole subject was remote from their lives.

I will divide my subject into two parts :—

(1) The Religious Outlook *Within* the Church.

(2) The Religious Outlook *Outside* the Church.

The five churches in which I ministered might be classified thus : (1) Moderate—mining and spinning; (2) High—agricultural and industrial; (3) Evangelical High—wealthy, middle-class, with two-thirds industrial and very poor; (4) High—agricultural; (5) Modernist—industrial. In all, nearly every other

theological outlook was held, and representatives of all other social classes existed, but the predominant forces were as given above. It is necessary for my readers to know that I am summarizing that which follows from diaries, having always been eager to learn how the worshippers looked on religion. Space being limited, I must generalize under a few heads, and these as definite as possible: (*a*) The extreme supernatural; (*b*) The limited-miraculous; and (*c*) Christian-ethical.

The Extreme Supernatural. They were probably ten per cent. of a congregation of 1,000, chiefly ageing people, who stedfastly believed in verbal inspiration, the certainty of heaven and hell, and conversion in its most miraculous form; but even 24 years ago they were much perplexed over Old Testament miracles. The rest had no pronounced characteristics, unless closely examined. Haeckel's 'Riddle of the Universe' was then widely read and Evolution was a bogey. From the Vicar downwards, the old foundations were tottering. I was startled, and then pained to find that in private conversation they confessed they could not accept the Virgin Birth. There was a strong and active minority who questioned the cosmology of Genesis, and who made sport of the literal content of the stories in the same book. They had no true belief in the Real Presence, but numbers attended Celebration as a matter of form, tradition and duty. My diaries record: 'It is strange how few there are who realise there is any special help, inspiration, or comfort derived from Holy Communion.'

The Christian Ethic is not a moving reality. They accept the general standards of life, and although these are productive of much that is socially valuable, it is far from being expressive of the Master's mind on purity, peace, and justice. Worldly-wisdom is confidently accounted the highest wisdom—thrift, industry, gain. These are the dominant virtues. But, side by side with this, there was almost complete agreement in the five churches, there was something lacking in the teaching of the ministers (which, for them, was the Church) on true democracy, charity, and fellowship.

I can now say positively that this has been, and is still, the strong conviction of nearly all the members of all the churches in which I have ministered.

In my second church I found that 'High Churchmanship' could be imposed upon a small minority, but I found scepticism rife even amongst those who most frequently attended 'Mass.' They revealed to me fundamental doubts, and save all but a very few lapsed ultimately into indifference. The Roman Catholic genuflexions were performed reverently, but the English Catholics wore their rue with a difference. There was little or nothing in their lives and character to distinguish them from others, save a sort of vestment jargon, colouring their occasional talk. In my diary I find the frequent comment: 'How completely is the laity dependent upon the ministrations of the clergy for their continuance in religious exercises!' I was surprised, too, at their neglect of 'family prayer,' of the Bible, and preparation for the reception of Holy Communion. And I repeatedly find in my diary such remarks as these: 'Religion inside the churches seems more and more perfunctory and parasitic!'

Instinctively I realised that the lack of anything approaching deep religious conviction, still less passion, within the churches must have its reactions outside, and this led me to enquire carefully into the condition of some of those who did not attend. Before I pass on to consider more intimate matters, I will now give the details of the partial yet representative census referred to in the opening sentences of this article:

Out of every 100 *houses*:—

Attending Church and Chapel.		Children at	Bibles	Prayer-book or	
Male.	Female.	Sunday School.	in house.	Missal in house.	Hymn-books.
3	27	58	48	24	36

These figures represent the *best* and not the worst aspect of the situation, for 'attending church' frequently means no more than (1) very infrequent attendance, and (2) attendance of men at a Brotherhood, or of women at a Bible Class. The children's attendances at Sunday School is often very perfunctory and irregular, nearly confined to visits around Whit-week and Christmas festivities. It is frequently stated that Roman Catholics are much more attached to their Church than Protestants, but careful enquiry and constant visitations in the city of which I am writing and the other parishes referred to above, does not con-

firm this common belief. The table above includes the Catholic element, and, in one street made up of 24 houses, I found that not one member of any family ever attended church or school, and had not been at 'Mass' for at least a year. The erroneous belief is probably grounded on the fact that the church adjacent is a small one, and is generally crowded by the faithful at the masses, being in the centre of a dense population. I also find large masses of Roman Catholics who are Modernist in tendency, disregarding the calls and claims of the priesthood, and talking quite plainly about the errors of Roman claims and theology and utterly condemning the attitude of their Church to 'mixed marriages.' There can be no doubt at all that the Roman ministry is devoted to that which it conceives to be its duty, visiting the flock with great regularity and diligence, so no fault can be attributed to them. It is germane to the subject under our consideration to make clear that Nonconformity as confessed by its own admirable ministers, and in reply to my enquiries, is in a situation more serious than any they have experienced, and many are nearly despairing of the possibilities of revival.

The position, faithfully and reluctantly described above may now be fittingly summarized: Out of every 100 homes, 70 adults never attend a place of worship at all, 50, or one-half of the homes do not possess any devotional book of any kind, 32 children (at present) are lost completely to our Sunday schools. I consider this to be a brighter record than are the true facts, and for the reasons already given.

I pass now to set down that which I have definitely elicited from the people themselves, as the reasons given for their neglect of public worship, and so far as is possible in the order of their numerical importance: (1) 'We do not see that church attendance produces any real Fellowship. If the minister (I use the word as the more representative title) shows any regard for us it is not disinterested, is often priggish, and it is easily seen he is far more at home with "swells." He comes to "fill his church," but has no true interest in our more pressing concerns.' This must be taken as a very general summary of alleged defects (social) in the ministers. (2) A very large proportion, far higher than is generally believed (I speak of the five parishes in

which I have ministered) are unable, for intellectual reasons, to attend church. These are amongst the more intelligent class of artizans, who are much better informed and more widely read than is commonly represented. They are acute, and can think things through. These are generally silent on religious questions, or at least courteously reticent. They will only reveal their thoughts after their confidence is won. A mere 'call' is of no avail, often more harmful than helpful, and eliciting nothing. I find these men and women most interesting, who can elicit all the mental and spiritual forces one may possess. And with adequate knowledge and proper social sympathy, may frequently be led to a more spiritual state. A cruder type (generally strong personalities) informs you 'it is all dope,' and useless for me and mine. They are a growing number, and their character is, in the main, clean and incorruptible. I will refer to these later.

(3) This is a democratic age, and keen and well-informed reformers are numerous. There are far more seekers of truth than of gain, but they find dissatisfaction in the fact that true education is not for them. They read and think (necessarily after a desultory fashion) and are aloof from the Churches, for they think that the Founder of them presented a Gospel which implied a better social order, and that the ministers are content with things as they are. These people devote their leisure, their scanty savings, and constant attention to organizations which they believe to be more in harmony with the mind of Jesus than the Churches.

It is necessary to emphasise the fact that large numbers worship Jesus who never attend a place of worship. It is not true to say of these artizans that absence from church always implies abstention from its Founder. (4) Good men and women, of definite Christian belief, give as their reason for not going to church, that the services (not only Anglican) are routine, the sermons insipid, even an 'insult to a working man's intelligence,' that the hymns are banal, and a score of other deficiencies, felt or imagined, in church worship. They further state that 'fuss is not fellowship,' and the shake of the hand is a professional way of manifesting a formal and frigid character. (5) Passing over many minor objections, I will conclude with that which is most common of all. There is nothing I know

more vocally denounced than the conduct of formal moralists masquerading as Christian. These seem to constitute a majority within the churches. Their motives are suspect. They offer patronage instead of love. They come and go to and from church without a suggestion that they are related to any circles but their own. In business, at work, their standard is that of the world, and they are vastly more satisfied with themselves than the Pharisee in the parable. The Church, say numbers of those we are considering, would succeed if only it produced Christians.

In conclusion, I would strike a more promising note. The Church will have to be satisfied with less if it is to achieve more. The artizan can be won through literature and idealism, *i.e.* the best thought expressive of a Living Lord, and the surrender of self to the service of all. Jesus is still a vital and divine force, outside the churches. But the people acclaim Him as a Man fighting man's battle. The more human and catholic we make Him, the more divine and universal is His appeal. It would require far more space than I am allowed, to illustrate this further, but I find that if we deal with all concerns touching human life and its conditions, and illuminate our doctrines with the borrowed genius of the world's greatest thinkers from Plato to Ruskin, the response to His appeal is more general, and the result is a definite growth in the almost infinite character of man.

THOUGHTS ON THE CHURCH

V. AUTHORITY.

By the Rev. J. C. Hardwick.

AFTER the Prayer Book fiasco, and even before it, the question of spiritual authority became prominent. The book had behind it the almost unanimous authority of bishops, but this did not satisfy those who regarded it as deficient or hesitating in Catholic doctrine or practice. They reminded the public that the bishops responsible for the book, though their episcopal Orders were indubitably derived from the Apostles, and carried with them the corresponding supernatural gifts, nevertheless must be held to have suffered some diminution or

dilution of their authority through the anomalous method of their appointment by officials of a secular state, who might themselves be atheists or Nonconformists.

This dilutory theory of episcopal authority is based upon distinctions too fine to appeal to the theologically immature. The novice would hold that if the efficacy of episcopal Orders is as great as we are taught to believe, it should suffice to cancel out any anomalies in the method of selecting those who are to receive them. If Catholic theory is worth anything, and not merely a device on the part of bishops and clergy for getting their opinions accepted without the necessity of making them appear reasonable, a bishop is a bishop whatever the method whereby he was selected to receive the supernatural gifts inherent in episcopal Orders. A boot-boy, if regularly ordained bishop, merits the obedience of the faithful, and his admonitions or judgments should carry more weight than those of the most learned divines in an inferior station.

Those who believe implicitly in episcopal authority, however, are naturally prone to criticize it when it goes against them. Nor are theological malcontents ever at a loss for a theory to meet their own needs; and a weak theory is better than none at all.

But even those who devised and supported the new Prayer Book, and were inconsolable at its rejection by Parliament, were quick to raise this question of spiritual authority. We were reminded that the Church, as a spiritual body, has its inalienable rights, which it cannot surrender to the secular State. It possesses an 'inherent spiritual authority.' That the secular State should interfere in a purely spiritual matter, such as the compilation of a liturgy, was made to appear in the light of an infringement of the most sacred rights of spiritual liberty. In short, the disappointed party exhaled its just indignation in the familiar language of edification and reproach.

The public remained calm; either through indifference, or because it knew that the politicians were too preoccupied to take up the challenge, and episcopal utterances are not meant to be taken too seriously. But the thorny question of spiritual authority had nevertheless been raised, and it was evident that it would not rest until it had been thoroughly ventilated. And

indeed, if its complete ventilation results, our recent dissensions will have been almost worth while; for the time is fully ripe for an entirely new, and far less artificial, conception of spiritual authority in the Church of England. Such a theory will not be devised by *a priori* speculation, still less by reverting to theories based upon an uncritical view of Scripture, or an unhistorical view of the origin of doctrines and institutions. It will have to be based upon facts of experience which we see around us, and which can be tested at any time.

Any theory of spiritual authority is a theory of knowledge —*i.e.* as to how truth is obtained in the spiritual sphere, and more especially in the spheres of conduct and religion. And if we desire to understand how mankind attains religious truth, the sound method is to ask how mankind attains truth in other spheres, for example, those of science and of art. In science, as is well known, we have the method of hypothesis and experiment. Facts are observed, and a theory is framed to fit the facts. This holds the field until a better one can be devised, or until fresh facts come to light which make the old theory untenable. In science there are no such things as final and permanent dogmas; a perpetual process of revision is going on. There are indeed scientific doctrines which have every appearance of permanence; but they only hold their position because the consensus of scientific opinion is that they fit the known facts better than any other theory. The credit of science itself is not thought to rest upon the permanence of theories devised by scientists.

In science it would be impossible to have progress if the truth about things were regarded as being already settled, so that neither new facts, nor new ways of explaining the old facts would be welcomed. Science cannot be creative if there is no new truth to create. Thus the progress of science depends upon the admission of two things; first that the programme of science is infinite, there are endless new truths to be discovered; second that men of science are to be free to conduct the search for these new truths, without their way being blocked by dead theories. In short, the progress of science depends upon its freedom to progress. But although the student of science can only be creative if he is free, the achievements of his predecessors are the material in which he works. If he chooses to be free in the sense

of disregarding what others have achieved up to date, his own contributions are not likely to be of much value. The student of a science stands on the shoulders of those who have worked in that sphere before him, which is just why he can see further than they could.

The parallel between science and religion is not completely exact, as the subjective element evidently enters into the latter far more than into the former. Religion is concerned with things which cannot be measured quantitatively. The perceptions of the saint are not reducible to mathematical formulae, as are those of the physicist. The fact is that the parallel between art and religion is much closer than that between science and religion, since art, like religion, is concerned with the qualitative, and not merely quantitative, aspects of existence.

Progress in art depends partly upon improved perception, and partly upon improved technique. Delicate perception enables the artist to see things and ideas, and technique enables him to convey his perceptions to others, or at least to give them expression, which others may interpret if they can, for it is not the artist's business to make all things plain.

It should be observed that the artist, like the men of science, has inherited both his powers of perception and his technique. His perception may be more delicate, and his technique more powerful, than those of his predecessors. He may, indeed, and not infrequently does, despise both the perception and the technique of his predecessors, but nevertheless, bad as they may now seem to him to be, he would not be where he now is without them. Like the man of science, he stands, or should stand, on the shoulders of his predecessors. He too is the heir of a long tradition, which he can only neglect at the price of making himself ridiculous. On the other hand, if he never makes any advances upon the traditions he has inherited, he becomes, not ridiculous, but dull; a mere imitator, and a poor imitator at that, because imitations are never equal to the original article. The very word original signifies something that is new and the product of creative genius.

On the whole, the tradition of art, both in perception and in technique, is longer than that of science. There was good art in Europe before there was much science of any value. The

scientific tradition has become immensely rich in a comparatively short time. Science, in a word, is a *parvenu*. There are, indeed, certain branches of art of which the tradition and technique is of comparatively recent origin; for example, orchestral music; but in general it is true that art has a longer history than science. And the longer the tradition behind any form of human activity, the greater will be its prestige. Which is why art, on the whole, is more conservative than science. But even art cannot afford (as we have seen) to be wholly conservative, at least in practice (it can be what it likes in theory). If it becomes too conservative, it becomes imitative and dull, and very quickly degenerates. The creative artist does not keep his eyes fixed on the past. He is not ignorant of it; but neither is he ruled by it.

To pass on to religion. Like that of art the religious tradition is very old, far older than that of science. There is in fact more than one religious tradition, more than one religious technique, some of which are older than others, but none of them are new. Hence the tradition of religion, and this applies to all religious traditions, is extremely conservative. It is in fact even more conservative than that of art, since the religious tradition has been able to incorporate itself in institutions, and thus to establish a vested interest in what is old. Not that institutions necessarily have this effect. A scientific institution like the Royal Society does help to promote scientific progress; though it is not so certain that the corresponding Royal Academy does the same for art. Yet it is not difficult to conceive of an artistic institution which should promote the progress of art; even though in art, as in religion, progress cannot be organized, for 'the Spirit bloweth where it listeth.' Nor is it impossible to imagine the existence of a religious institution, *i.e.* a church, which should promote progress in religion. Though by progress in religion is not to be understood the persuasion of a large number of people to think and act as we do, which is only compassing heaven and earth to gain one proselyte. By progress in religion is meant more delicate perception, and more effective technique. For a number of centuries this is what the Catholic Church did for Europe, and it is what an effective religious institution would be doing for any community in which it existed. It would be productive of new religious ideas and methods; it

would, in a word, be creative, and not as our Church is now, merely preservative. The scientific or artistic institution which should confine itself to the preserving of old traditions would not be thought to be fulfilling its proper function. But a religious institution seems to do little else than preserve an already existing tradition without attempting to add to it or do anything but exploit it. On the contrary it vigorously resists any such attempts which it regards in the light of betrayals of the tradition delivered to its care, instead of being legitimate and necessary developments. It is evident that this attitude of religious institutions is the chief cause of the present moribund condition of religion amongst us. Were scientific institutions similarly inspired, science, too, would be moribund; since growth can only take place when there is freedom to grow. Science and art at present progress, but religion declines or remains stationary. And this must be due either to the restrictive influence of unprogressive institutions, or to the fact that religion is, as its enemies urge, a form of human activity which belongs to the infancy of the human race, and not to its maturity. The present attitude of religious institutions certainly creates the impression that the latter view is the true one. In fact it might appear that religious institutions, as at present inspired, are the worst enemies that religion has to contend with. But for them we might experience something in the nature of a religious revival.

But to return to the problem of religious authority. If the foregoing view of religious life and progress is the true one, it will follow that the ultimate religious authority cannot be found where either Protestants or Catholics look for it. The total sum of religious truth cannot be contained within a single book or religious literature. Nor can we look to find the whole of truth in the corporate pronouncements of a religious institution, whether uttered through a single mouthpiece or otherwise. Though to be sure the former view is the more tenable, and would actually be the true one if the institution in question allowed freedom to the individual. Indeed, the religious institution whose members enjoyed freedom, might well be the most efficient instrument of religious progress in the spheres both of knowledge and of practice, *i.e.* both in perception and in technique. And this is just what we maintain should be the rôle of

he Church of England. It should look for religious truth (*i.e.* t should accept as its authority in religion) to the creative individual nourished within the religious tradition of which the Church is an embodiment. This emphasis upon the individual s of first importance because the individual is evidently the growing point of the community of which he is a member. The laim to corporate inspiration must always be untenable. All hat a corporation or institution can possess is a deposit of tradition accumulated by individuals in the past. It can never be reative as an institution; creation, progress, comes through he individual member. The *raison d'être* of a religious institution is that it should produce a continual supply of creative ndividuals nourished in its tradition, and enriching it. And no one can enrich a tradition without at the same time adopting a ritical attitude towards it. The Hebrew religious tradition was ncalculably enriched by heretics and sceptics like the writers of *Job*, *Jonah*, and *Ecclesiastes*, who rejected the current tradition. It was St. Paul, the critic of Judaism, who gave to the udaic religious tradition a new lease of life, revitalizing it so hat it was able to conquer and absorb Hellenism. It is often he destroyers who are the great initiators; and these cannot be other than individuals. Progress in religion as in art and science comes through creative personalities. The individual, and not he corporation or institution, that is the organ of the Holy Ghost. To imagine that the deliberations of an ecclesiastical assembly can be inspired in any other sense than in which the deliberations of an ordinary board meeting are inspired is both idiculous and presumptuous. This is the fallacy of Pharisaism. These deliberations are no doubt useful, as the deliberations of board of guardians are useful, but to call them inspired is a misuse of language which obscures the meaning of the word nspiration. Crowd emotion, or intrigue, or mere expediency, or gross bigotry and ignorance, have often been the ruling actors in prompting the decisions of ecclesiastical assemblies; nd at their highest they have not risen above the heights eached often by political and other associations. If ecclesiastical assemblies reach conclusions consistent only with plain common-sense, we have every reason to be thankful.

The source of progress, and of new truth, then, is the individual. And all conceptions of religious authority which ignore, or depreciate the value of, the individual, are thereby stultified. Here lay, and still lies, the genuine religious value of Protestantism; in its emancipation of, and in its concentration of attention upon, the individual. Here indeed, and not in its untenable (though at the time indispensable) doctrine of an infallible Bible, lies the true genius of Protestantism. It is to this element in the Reformation to which the Church of England should remain loyal.

As for theories of corporate inspiration; if they mean more than that the institution preserves a tradition which itself was the creation of individuals, and which will be augmented by other individuals in the future, all such theories are unhistorical, misleading, and inimical to religious life. This is the dead hand which constricts religion, starves it, and in the end kills it. And in any case, even if the theory of corporate inspiration were less fatal than it is, the Church of England would do well closely to scrutinize its claims before accepting it. For the accepting of it, even in the modified and untenable form of it to which Anglican bishops have lent their authority, has in the end but the one logical consequence, Rome. That is to say, it means the end of the Church of England, as indeed present events are quite clearly showing. The bishops do not realize that in the Romanizing movement they are faced not merely, as they seem to suppose, by an irresponsible and indisciplined faction, but by a logical tendency; a tendency to find the complete, and not partial, embodiment of a principle. A movement of this sort cannot be bullied or manipulated or bribed; the Romanizers will carry on, and what is more they will take the Church of England with them. They stand for something definite, for an ideal; and the natural movement of events aids their efforts.

Though they do not realize it, the bishops can check this movement only by abandoning the historically untenable view of Church authority which the Oxford Movement resuscitated from its Laudian grave. It has been a *damnosa hereditas* to all who have held it; and in any case it is unhistorical, and inconsistent with the peculiar genius of the English Church. That Church, as a product of the Renaissance, should stand for free-

om of thought, and for liberty of the individual. It might be ought that this would be to make indiscipline even greater. here would, however, be far greater unanimity of spirit than ow prevails when no one can tell what the Church stands for. Ve should feel that we were members of an institution whose ole object was religious progress, not the stabilization of ac-epted theories, the entrenching of ecclesiastical vested interests.

JESUS IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS*

By the Rev. H. G. Hatch, Ph.D.

THIS paper has been suggested by an important question, namely, Is the Christian faith rooted in history? Is there sufficient historical basis for the Christian religion?

In a superficial way, we probably can all answer it in the ffirmative. For though there are those who contend that Jesus Christ is a mythological figure, most people who have thought bout the subject will agree that the evidence for the historical xistence of Jesus is as satisfactory as it is for other great figures f history. The historicity of Jesus being admitted, then it is easonable to conclude that the Christian religion is in some vay connected with Him.

This, however, is a very meagre conclusion. The real ques-ion is this: Does the main content of the Christian religion, or t least its core, owe its origin to Jesus? This is a difficult ques-ion to answer, for we know the Christian religion has assumed lifferent forms, and there is probably no general agreement as o what is the main content or the core of the Christian religion. Some, for instance, would find the characteristic feature of the Christian religion in a beautiful ethic of love towards God and neighbour, and it might be comparatively easy to show that this beautiful ethic was taught by Jesus, even though He Himself derived it from the Law and the Prophets. This view of Christianity, however, does not do justice to what as a historical fact has been the special characteristic of Christianity, namely, ts belief in the uniqueness of Jesus' Person. The faith of Christians all through the ages has centred in Jesus as the

*A paper read at Purley and East Surrey Branch of the Modern Church-men's Union.

Christ, and the content of that title has overflowed into another more specifically Christian — the Only-Begotten Son of God. A vital and constantly recurring question is this: Can this faith be justified by an appeal to the Jesus of history? Was Jesus in fact so unique a figure, unique in His self-consciousness, unique in His character, that we are constrained to express our belief about Him in the terms of the Christian Creed?

Now where can we find the Jesus of history portrayed? It is plain that if the Gospels do not give us a good deal of authentic information about the Jesus of history, we must sadly confess that we cannot know anything at all about Him. But, as we all know, the Gospels do not occupy quite the same position in our minds as they did for earlier generations of Christians. For them it was enough that anything should be stated in the Four Gospels in order to be accepted as indisputable. We, on the contrary, know that scholars have submitted the Gospels to criticism, and we ask ourselves, Can we be sure that what is stated in them as being said and done by Jesus is true? Some of you, perhaps all, know that there has been much controversy over the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel. This is a subject for special treatment, and therefore I am not going to enter into it to-night. I have limited myself to the field of the Synoptic Gospels.

Now I am not going to suggest that even these three Gospels can be used uncritically. They cannot; yet I am going to make the moderate statement that they do give much authentic information about the Jesus of history. You will probably have heard of the Gospel source Q. This is the name given to a hypothetical document which lies behind the First and Third Gospels, and of which the authors of these both made use. It has long been recognized as a first-class authority for the teaching of Jesus, coming perhaps from the Apostle Matthew. Then *Mark*, the earliest of our Gospels in their present form, is probably based in part on the reminiscences of St. Peter, and, in the words of Headlam, gives 'a coherent and intelligible, but by no means a complete, account of our Lord's ministry.' Matthew and Luke, besides making use of Q, have incorporated into their narrative large portions of the Marcan story. But in addition, both Matthew and Luke have material peculiar to them-

elves, which each derived from some special and, generally peaking, reliable source. So that we see we have a good deal f information from which to derive a fairly trustworthy portrait f the Jesus of history. Of course I am aware that sceptics ould challenge this general statement of mine, but I can only y that I believe it to be justified by a sane and critical survey f the facts. We have, then, four early sources of information r the Life of Jesus: Q, Mark, and a good deal of the material eculiar to Matthew and Luke respectively. (The names Iatthew and Luke are here used without prejudice to denote e authors of the First and Third Gospels respectively.)

Possibly there are some people who have not studied the ynoptic Gospels very closely who think they do not afford us ery much support for the characteristic faith of the Church oncerning Jesus. In the Fourth Gospel, Jesus makes very efinite claims concerning Himself, *e.g.* 'Before Abraham was, am'; 'I and my Father are one.' Now in the Synoptic Gospels e do not find Jesus making claims like these. Yet we do find them enough to justify us in asserting the uniqueness of esus' Person, a uniqueness of which He Himself was conscious, nd which manifested itself in His words and in His deeds. he Figure who comes before us in the Synoptic Gospels is not at of One who goes about making claims, yet there is in His ords and works a challenge: Who say ye that I am?

Notwithstanding this challenge of Jesus' personality, we ay admit at the outset that He stands before us indubitably as Ian. He shares our human nature: He is weary, hungry, and irsty; He shrinks from death, and He needs the support which omes in answer to prayer. But for all His human limitations, esus is conscious of a unique mission which He alone can lfil. His consciousness of the Messianic vocation is plainly dicated at the commencement of two of our sources, Mark and . The significance of the Voice and the Vision at the Baptism this, that Jesus is called to undertake the Messianic task, the sk of the long-expected Messiah, that is, God's Anointed. At is Baptism, He heard the voice of the Father, 'Thou art my on, the Beloved; in thee I am well pleased,' words which recall vo Old Testament passages: *Ps.* ii, 7, 'The Lord said unto e, Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee'; and *Is.*

xlii, 1, 'Behold my servant, whom I uphold; my chosen, in whom my soul delighteth.' In the Voice from Heaven, Jesus heard Himself addressed as the Servant-King. But if the Servant-King, He needs to be anointed, and that is why there came also the vision of the Dove: it was the symbol of His anointing with the Spirit.

Immediately after His Baptism, Jesus goes into the wilderness, where He is tempted. It is as the Messiah that He is tempted, for the temptations are all relevant to His Messianic vocation. In them He received a fuller insight into the manner in which He was to perform His task. He is tempted first to doubt the reality of His Messianic vocation: 'If thou art the Son of God'; and, secondly, to fulfil it by choosing the lower and easier course rather than the higher and more arduous. He was tempted, that is, 'to build the Kingdom on bread,' to perform some startling sign, to accommodate Himself to the spirit of the world, rather than to tread the way of the Cross, the pathway of suffering and service. There can, I think, be no doubt that Jesus commenced His ministry in the consciousness that He was the Promised One, the Anointed of the Lord.

As the story of Jesus' ministry proceeds, we find other indications of His Messianic consciousness. He accepts the confession of St. Peter, 'Thou art the Christ'; He acknowledges at the trial that He is the Christ, and He is crucified as the rejected 'King of the Jews.' When the Baptist sent messengers to Jesus asking the question, 'Art thou he that cometh, or look we for another?' Jesus, without making any explicit declaration, 'I am He,' supplies the evidence which would enable the Baptist to draw the correct inference: 'Go your way and tell John what things ye have seen and heard' (*Lk.* vii 19 *ff*).

But according to Mark, the Messiahship of Jesus was not publicly avowed until His trial. When Peter confesses His Messiahship, Jesus charges His disciples that they shall tell no man of Him (viii, 30). I think Schweitzer's theory is right, namely, that there was a Messianic secret attached to Jesus' ministry. The secret which Judas betrayed probably related to the Master's Messianic consciousness. None of our sources records any formal and public claim of Jesus to be the Messiah

and the terms of Jesus' answer to John were probably in part dictated by His desire to avoid an open declaration.

Some of Jesus' words, however, imply a more than Messianic consciousness. They imply a claim to moral and spiritual allegiance. In this sense He already stands before us in the Gospel pages as Lord. The fact is illustrated by the demands He makes on His disciples, His exacting terms; *e.g.* 'If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me' (*Mk.* viii, 34); 'So therefore whosoever he be of you that renounceth not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple' (*Lk.* xiv, 33). This authority assumed by Jesus over His disciples during His earthly ministry helped to prepare the way for the Early Church's recognition of Him as 'our Lord.' And we may in this connection recall Jesus' argument that even David had referred to the future Messiah as 'my lord.' 'David himself called him Lord; and whence is he his son' (*Mk.* xii, 37). Since it is David who is thought of as using the title, the rank and dignity must surpass that of any earthly sovereign.

The authority assumed by Jesus was more than that of a teacher. He speaks as one conscious of being the Incarnate Wisdom of God. Of great significance is His authoritative formula, 'I say unto you,' in introducing His precepts. He delivers Himself more particularly in this way when comparing His dicta with the authoritative pronouncements of the Law, and He does so in a way which implies that the revelation given to Moses of God's commands is being supplemented and even superseded in some details by a newer revelation, final and perfect. He speaks in no less a rôle than that of Law-Giver to the new Israel of God, that is, if we be careful not to think of His law as a code of rules. It is as if He were saying, 'More than Moses is here.' He taught not as the scribes, but as having authority, authority direct from God, and without any human intermediary. In a line with this evidence is the gracious invitation, 'Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you and learn of me' (*Mt.* xi, 28 *f.*). A similar authority is assumed by Jesus in His attitude to the tradition of the elders, 'making all meats clean' (*Mk.* vii, 19), and His claim to be lord of the Sabbath (*Mk.* ii, 18).

We have, then, scattered throughout our Gospel sources many indications of an exalted self-consciousness of Jesus. Yet as I have contended, He does not publicly announce His Messiahship. If He had done so before the appointed time, He could only have set on foot a Messianic movement of a political character which could in no way have furthered the Kingdom as He conceived it. For in Jesus' day a popular and widespread notion concerning the Messiah was that He should be an earthly Deliverer, a Deliverer from the Gentile yoke, and bringing back the golden age of David. It is difficult to believe that the training of the Apostles for their future work could have been promoted had Jesus prematurely announced His Messiahship. It was necessary that Jesus should impress on the Messianic title His own meaning, and that meaning was a unique one in that it combined two apparently antithetic ideas—that of the heavenly Son of Man, and that of the Servant of the Lord.

No one who has studied the questions relating to the title 'Son of Man' in the Gospel pages is unaware that it is one of the most difficult problems of the New Testament. I am only just skimming the surface in the following remarks. Jesus, in using this title, referred to Himself in the third person; *e.g.* 'The Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins' (*Mk.* ii, 10); 'He began to teach them that the Son of Man must suffer many things' (*Mk.* viii, 31); 'Ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming with the clouds of heaven' (*Mk.* xiv, 62). This last instance gives us a clue to the significance of the title in Jesus' mouth. For it apparently has some connection with *Dan.* vii, 13, where we have a picture of one who 'came with the clouds of heaven,' who is 'like unto a son of man,' and to whom a universal and everlasting kingdom is given. It is this description which underlies the picture in the Apocalyptic work entitled 'The Parables of Enoch,' the picture of the supernatural Being whose countenance has the appearance of a man, who sits on a throne of glory, and to whom is given the sum of judgment.

It would seem that in Jesus' generation there was, beside the conception of the Messiah as an earthly, although ideal ruler, also this other notion, that of a supernatural figure who

ıould come on the clouds of heaven. I am taking up a debate-
ble position, perhaps, but I cannot help believing that Jesus
id make use of this latter conception, though not without trans-
ıuting it. The evidence of the Gospels seems clear that Jesus
id teach that the Apocalyptic Son of Man was shortly to come
in the glory of His Father, with the holy angels,' and the
nswer to the High Priest suggests that He believed He Him-
elf was to be manifested as this supernatural Son of Man (*Mk.*
iv, 62). But, as I have said, Jesus did not make use of the title
ithout transmuting its significance. The phrase 'the son of
ıan' is used not only in apocalyptic literature like Daniel and
Enoch, it is used also in the *Psalms* and in *Ezekiel* (with a
ınguistic difference, however), where it connotes the idea of
ıuman frailty and weakness. And this idea of human frailty
nd weakness probably entered in as a contributory element in
ne mind of Jesus when He took the phrase on His lips. And
o Jesus, in using the title Son of Man, combines with the idea
f majesty the idea of humiliation. Not only is the Son of Man
o come in glory, He has already come in lowly guise. 'The
on of Man is come eating and drinking' with publicans and
inners (*Lk.* vii, 34), and He 'hath not where to lay His head'
Lk. ix, 58). What is even more extraordinary than this, this
ıpernatural Son of Man is to 'suffer many things.' He came
to give His life a ransom for many' (*Mk.* x, 45). In these
assages the conception is linked with another and apparently
ontradictory one, namely, that of the Suffering Servant of the
ord, who is spoken of in several oracles in the *Book of Isaiah*,
specially *Is.* lii, 13—liii, 12, where we have that wonderful des-
ription of the Man of Sorrows, who is despised and rejected
f men. I should contend that even as early as His Baptism
esus had some awareness that He was to tread the pathway of
umiliation, for, as I have said, the Voice announced to Him
His vocation in terms that brought to His mind not merely the
ole of the Messianic King, but also that of the Servant of the
ord. As Jesus' career proceeded, it became more and more
lear to Him that He was the despised and rejected One, and at
ne Last Supper He explicitly announced to His disciples that
ne great Servant prophecy concerned Himself: 'For I say unto
ou, that this which is written must be fulfilled in me, And he

was reckoned with the transgressors' (*Lk.* xxii, 37). He was, however, conscious that His death would not be unavailing. His blood was the 'blood of the covenant, which is shed for many' (*Mk.* xiv, 24). We recall also that the giving of His life was a ransom 'for many.' The significance of this is that the shedding of His blood was the initiation of the new covenant, whereby God should enter into a new relation with His people. By His own atoning death, He should establish the Kingdom. And so He speaks in the same breath not only of His approaching death, but of His triumph over death. The Son of Man should suffer many things, but after three days He should rise again. Through suffering the Son of Man should enter into His glory. The Cross was the condition of the Crown. This was one of the outstanding characteristics of Jesus' Messianic consciousness, that the apocalyptic conception of the Son of Man and the prophetic conception of the Servant of Jahweh, though outwardly antithetic, were, as Charles puts it, reconciled and fulfilled in a deeper unity.

It is along these lines that we must interpret Jesus' prophecies of the coming of the Son of Man in His glory. Was Jesus mistaken when He prophesied that in His own generation the Kingdom of God should come with power? We must answer in the affirmative only if we believe that Jesus accepted apocalyptic notions without transforming them. We may believe that He was much influenced by apocalyptic notions, and that He looked for a proximate coming of the Son of Man 'with the clouds of heaven.' Further, the evidence points to the conclusion that He believed He Himself should be manifested as this supernatural Son of Man. But we need not believe that He was disappointed of His hope. Rather we are to believe that His words and His cause were vindicated in His Resurrection, in the outpouring of the Spirit and the birth of the Church. In using apocalyptic imagery, Jesus fittingly conveys the impression of a glorious parousia of a majestic Son of Man, and there is no reason to suppose we come nearer to the heart of things when we divest ourselves of the symbolic. This eschatological and enigmatical element in the self-consciousness of Jesus has been largely ignored by the liberal Harnack school and thereby they have failed to do justice to the Gospel portrait

of the Jesus of history. For them Jesus is a gracious teacher, calling men to a realization of their filial relationship with God, and to the practice of an ideal in harmony therewith, namely, the law of love, and He Himself points the way by His own example. This conception of Jesus is a great and noble one, but it does not completely answer to the Synoptic presentation of the self-consciousness of Jesus. Yet on the other hand, if we give undue weight to the eschatological and enigmatical element in the thought of Jesus, as Schweitzer does, we seem to make of Him a mistaken and enthusiastic visionary. That Jesus did entertain the apocalyptic hope there can be no doubt. Even in Q, Jesus warns His disciples to be ready for the Parousia of the Son of Man. Yet this is not the whole of His teaching. We need to take into account the teaching of Jesus which does not directly concern His Person, especially His teaching concerning the Kingdom. The Kingdom is futuristic in character, yet in a sense it is already present, 'among you,' or 'within you.' Some utterances appear to pre-suppose an evolutionary process in the establishment of the Kingdom: the Kingdom was to grow and expand. The ethic of the Kingdom was to be one of humility and service and love, and as such is not inconsistent with the idea of the Kingdom as coming by an evolutionary process; yet alone this view does not do full justice to the thought of Jesus, in which the Kingdom was something unearthly, from above. Jesus' idea of the Kingdom was not the phantasm of an apocalyptic dreamer, yet it was of something more mysterious than the presentation of the liberal school. In the Resurrection and Pentecost there was a real coming of the Kingdom with power; the Kingdom was indeed realized, though only as the fully-developed organism is present in the cell. If this view is correct, it follows that the Christian Church is in one sense the Messianic Kingdom which Jesus proclaimed.

The supernatural character of the Kingdom answers to the supernatural character of the Messiah. It has been suggested—following Schweitzer—that the secret which Judas betrayed had relation to Jesus' Messianic consciousness. May it not be that it was not merely the secret of Jesus' Messiahship which Judas betrayed, but the secret of His supernatural Messiahship? The claim to be Messiah was not in itself blasphemous, though Jesus'

enemies, impelled by their hatred, might have construed it as such; and it is not until Jesus, after acknowledging before the high priest that He is the Messiah, goes on to utter the mysterious prophecy about the Son of Man's Parousia that He is condemned on a capital charge. When the religious authorities drew from Jesus the confession that He was claiming identity or solidarity with the Heavenly Son of Man, the future Judge, then it was that they had substantial grounds for accomplishing their pre-determined vengeance. But they have to secure Pilate's sanction to His condemnation, and to this end He is represented as claiming to be King of the Jews, and that is the accusation written over Him.

The theory of the Messianic secret and its betrayal by Judas is at first sight inconsistent with the preaching at Nazareth and the triumphal entry into Jerusalem. Yet Jesus in His sermon at Nazareth did not divulge His Messianic consciousness so much as proclaim the dawn of the Messianic era. Our sources apparently represent Jesus as making a Messianic entry into Jerusalem, and it is likely that Jesus, in His method of entry, intended to fulfil the prophecy of *Zechariah* ix, 9, but the fact would not become clear to others till later. In this connection we should note the statement in *John* xii, 16, 'These things understood not the disciples at the first.'

We cannot but seek for an ultimate source of Jesus' Messianic consciousness. Where else can we find it but in a unique relationship with the Father? Such a relationship is fitly expressed in the traditional term Son. Of such a unique filial relationship Jesus was Himself conscious, as we see from certain features of the Synoptic records. It has often been noted that Jesus preserves a distinction in speaking of God as Father of Himself and as Father of His disciples: 'My Father,' 'Your Father,' not 'Our Father.' In *Mk.* xii, 35-37, the argument is that the Messiah is the Son of One more exalted than David. Who is the 'one, a beloved son' of *Mk.* xii, 6, but Jesus? Or 'the Son' in *Mk.* xiii, 32? Both at the Baptism and at the Transfiguration, He is addressed from heaven as God's Son; it may be admitted that this is a Messianic title, but may we assume that it is only Messianic? But the most famous passage of all is the Great Thanksgiving, *Lk.* x, 21, 22—*Mt.* xi, 25-27.

There has been much discussion concerning this passage, and Harnack endeavours to minimize its Johannine character by a reconstruction, omitting the clause, 'No one knoweth the Son save the Father,' and changing the tense from the present to the aorist. As thus reconstructed, the passage says nothing of a timeless relationship of the Father and the Son, but deals with circumstances of historical fact: its whole emphasis is upon the knowledge of God, which the Messiah is the first to receive, and its revelation to the simple ones. Yet even if we accept Harnack's attenuated version, it gives remarkable expression to the uniqueness of Jesus: He alone is the Son, and no one else can learn the doctrine except through Him. Supposing the knowledge of the Father is lifted out of the sphere of the timeless, the consciousness of exclusive knowledge separates Jesus from all the rest of the sons of men.

We may sum up the witness of the Christological data in the Synoptic records in the following statements:

That Jesus was conscious of a unique and central place in God's purpose for mankind;

That He thought of His present humiliation as the condition of His future glory, when He should be revealed as Judge;

That He assumed lordship over the hearts and lives of His disciples;

That He spoke with authority, showing men an ethical and spiritual ideal which is perfect and absolute;

That He knew Himself as God's Son in a unique and exclusive sense.

In a word, Jesus is perfect man; but there is an overplus, that which makes Him *sui generis*.

But the story does not end there. Such a self-consciousness, unless justified, was a contradiction of Jesus' religious genius, the production of an over-wrought imagination. The dilemma we have to face is that Jesus was either a megalomaniac or God's Chosen and Anointed Servant for the accomplishment of His purpose for the world. The former alternative is refuted by the birth and growth of the Church. If this vindication is illusory, if it be not God's verdict, then we find it difficult to believe in any rational ordering of the world.

Some will find it no difficult task to advance from the unique self-consciousness of Jesus to the Church's thought about Him as expressed in the Chalcedonian theology. Given that Jesus was not deluded, they will say, then we must believe it was the Eternal Logos who lived and spoke in Jesus. Here, of course, we leave the field of historical investigation and enter the realm of theology and philosophy. We find ourselves confronted with problems logical, psychological and metaphysical. These problems ultimately are insoluble. We can at least say this, that the faith of the Church in Jesus as the Only-Begotten Son of the Father has its foundation in the life and self-consciousness of Jesus of Nazareth. We can freely confess the uniqueness of Jesus. The question remains whether the doctrine of His Person is most adequately summed up in the term Incarnation. And here I would venture to suggest that if we wish to justify this traditional term we must appeal not only to the Jesus of history, but to the Christ of experience. It was through a religious experience, individual and corporate, that the doctrine of the Incarnation was reached. For the early Christians found in Jesus Christ redemption and salvation, and because of this fact they were able to pass—or rather were compelled to do so—to the confession, 'My Lord and my God.' And unless this experience, which has been shared by Christians in all ages, be an illusion, we must confess that He 'in whom we have our redemption, the forgiveness of our sins,' is also 'the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation' (*Col.* i, 14 *f.*).

GERMAN YOUTH

By P. C. Miller, B.A., Hertford College, Oxford.

THE youth of Germany is brimming over with idealism. This has one great drawback: one meets more young men to the square mile who consider that they are great poets or dramatists than one would in two or three English counties. The rough and tumble of English public school life knocks a great deal of nonsense out of a boy, but there is always the danger that with it much of his natural idealism should be knocked out as well and destroyed for ever. But on the whole such idealism is all to the good. In a stay of six months I was

struck by the absence of the materialistic outlook so common in England. Here the lives of innumerable young men are bounded by their girls, their motor-bicycles and the cinema. In Germany there are fewer motor-cycles, and the cinemas are smaller and less comfortable.

But quite apart from these small drawbacks against the leading of a purely materialistic life, the young men I have met seemed much older than their English contemporaries, and their interests were wider and their outlook on life much more serious. There is certainly a wave of sport sweeping the country, and it absorbs much of the physical energy that was formerly devoted to military training. But the sport is kept subordinated to ordinary life, and there are very few people who live for sport and worship sport. This cannot be said of England or America.

To leave school and enter almost any profession a boy has to pass his 'abitur' examination. This is very much harder than the English matriculation, and often proves too hard. There are numerous cases of suicide among young people who have failed to pass. Thus the ordinary boy's life is much harder than in England, and in addition the youth of Germany suffered a great deal under the blockade. The shortage of food for the last two years of the war was much more severe than anything we ever experienced. And since the war there have been the further sufferings of the 'Inflationszeit' (Inflation period), which many say was much worse than the war or the revolution.

But there is far less cynicism and disillusionment than one might expect. The German people has always been very docile. Lord d'Abernon, in his book *An Ambassador of Peace*, comments on the ease with which the Germans are swayed by mass-suggestion. Before and during the war the propaganda with which they were swayed was a particularly blatant type of race-glorification. The clergy were not behind-hand in following the lead of the All-Highest, and the sermons of many of them, like his, were based exclusively on the Old Testament, all the Christian virtues being kept in the background. In view of the utterances of many of our divines during the war, it is not for us to cast the first stone. It is hardly a comforting thought that we were perhaps not quite as bad as they. The whole business of propaganda is a discreditable one. Many people give

this as their reason for not going to church. It is not a very satisfactory one, but it is intelligible. And in Germany also there has been a reaction against this kind of patriotic preaching.

Since the war the schools in Germany have been democratized. There are very few private schools left; nearly everybody goes to the standard schools. This has led to secularization. There are lessons in 'Religion,' but they are not very frequent and not very inspiring.

The only legal marriage is now a state marriage. The attitude towards this is in many cases the same as the attitude of many people in England towards a registry office. It may satisfy the law, but a church marriage is the only proper marriage. Thus the legal ceremony, which takes place in the town hall before the town clerk, is often followed by a church service, but legally this has no value whatever.

A considerable number of people send their children to be confirmed for social reasons. This habit has its counterpart in England. But in Germany there are many more important social occasions when a child receives presents from all friends and relatives; and every opportunity is taken for a family reunion. Confirmation is one of these, and for girls especially it is from a social point of view a very important event. Naturally the other aspects are not always entirely ignored, but there are a large number of parents who send their children to be confirmed and do not again require the services of a parson until it is time for the children to get married. This attitude can also be paralleled in England, and many parents are not particularly solicitous about confirmation.

I asked a German from Munich to tell me what he thought of the general position of the churches in Germany, and he said: 'When I first came to England in 1888 to stay with my brother, I went to church three times, and took a Sunday school class for him in the afternoon. We were not allowed to open a newspaper; in fact, I don't think there were many Sunday newspapers, and we were not allowed to look at any book except the Bible. In England to-day things seem to be very different. There seem to be a great many people who never go to church at all and never seem to think of doing so. In Bavaria we are mostly Catholic. We were never so strict, but we have certainly

ot fallen off so greatly as you have in England. The Lutherans n the other parts of Germany are perhaps not quite as numerus as they were before the war, but I think that one could say ne same about them. In spite of our "Continental Sunday," ur churches are fuller. We have much fewer people without ny kind of religion at all.'

The Continental Sunday is indeed an institution that would stound many of our benevolent Watch Committees. The heatres and cinemas and concerts and parks are open on Sunays just as on any other day. On certain Sundays in the year, specially one or two before Christmas, the shops are open as vell. This of course interferes with a late evening service, but he morning services are well attended.

But apart from organized religion, the German youth shows ts idealism in many ways that are not formally connected with ny church, but which cannot be ignored in any examination of Christian influences. There are a large number of Youth Movenents, some of which professedly have nothing to do with the hurches; some of which are in a way neutral, while always ending to join organized churches; and some of which are ounded by the churches, although their objects are wider than rganized worship.

The best known of these are the 'Wandervogel,' founded by Karl Fischer at the beginning of this century. Their object is o get away from the cities at every opportunity, and Sunday is often the only convenient time for their 'Ausflug.' They have ections of 'Workers,' 'Catholics,' and 'Protestants,' but their nain object is to get into the open air, and they go for long oute marches singing their national folk-songs.

The 'Freideutsche Jugendbund' is expressly neither for nor against religious bodies. It is a movement against mechansm and over-intellectualism, and its general tendencies are in harmony with the expressionist dramas of Toller, and such nstitutions as the 'School of Wisdom' founded by Count Keyserling, and the Goetheanum founded under the influence of Rudolf Steiner. He and his disciples have spread a new eligion in Germany, Anthroposophy. I leard a lecture on it, ttended largely by old ladies. The lecturer began by making number of very sound statements about the dangers of over-

intellectualization, and then relapsed into a succession of cloudy neo-Hegelian abstractions, with hints of theosophy and Indian mysticism. The Germans have always been prone to reverence minor prophets who can produce cloudy Hegelian abstractions, but I doubt whether there are many anthroposophists under thirty. There are also Catholic Youth Movements, and Protestant Youth Movements, and numerous others, their objects being very similar, namely, a fuller life and a general revolt against rigid formularies. The members promise not to drink before a certain age, or not at all, and often also not to smoke. Occasionally their zeal to abolish conventions leads to immorality, but generally the moral tone is very high.

There are also societies of students for choral singing. One of the chief of these is the 'Finkensteiner Bund,' founded by Walther Hensel. This has branches in most of the towns in Germany. Groups of students have toured England singing religious music. This movement is not necessarily a religious movement, but it is hard for its participants to remain unmoved by religious influences, as most of the choral songs they sing are church-music.

The inflation has caused a great gulf to be fixed in the economic life of Germany. Among the fortunes that were wiped out were nearly all the foundations for scholarships. Thus there has grown up in the last few years an association largely run by the students themselves for helping needy students. This is almost entirely run by voluntary help. A student will sometimes give up a whole year of his student life, for a salary just enough to keep him alive, in order to help his fellow-students. The work is so exacting that he has no time at all to continue his studies. The universities contribute as much as they can, and the towns and States also give something, and there are some private benefactors. The students thus receive a few scholarships, but mostly cheap meals, cheap books, clothes and boots; and students who are leaving are enabled to borrow money without interest to be repaid within ten years. Social evenings are held, especially for foreign students, helping them to get to know one another, and at Christmas there are special festivities for those students who cannot get home. It is estimated that of the 100,000 students in German universities and

chnical colleges (Hochschulen) thirty per cent. have not suffi-ent to eat and wear and twenty per cent. have a bare minimum. hese figures are taken from the magazine issued by the tudent's Self-help Society for the month of January, 1929.

The German student is usually a specialist, and a specialist f a very high order. There is always the danger of over-pecialization, and many students pledge themselves to do nanual labour for a certain period to counteract the effects of arrow and exacting intellectual work. Professors I have met vho have been to England always admire the superior adapt-bility of the English student. We have not yet reached the tage in England where overwork at universities needs the anti-ote of some strenuous manual labour. The Germans have oncentrated too much on brains and are adapting themselves. t is high time that we adapted ourselves to doing a little more rainwork.

The German nation has suffered a great deal. Their re-overy has been amazing, but it is by no means complete. There s a general desire for World Peace, and, in spite of many rebuffs, ope in the League of Nations persists. There are reactionary olitici ans in Italy and Spain and France. There are signs that he idealism of America is being hindered by politicians. And n spite of Mr. Chamberlain's excellent speeches on peace, we urselves are spending an enormous amount on armaments. The reactionary element in Germany has not got the country ehind it. It only derives support because the peace-loving lement does not seem to make any headway against the militar-sm of the French. The churches of Germany are not reaction-ry, and the youth of Germany is not reactionary; but if the rmament bills continue to mount the strength of the idealism vill be damped.

BOOK REVIEWS

ANTHROPOLOGY AND THE BIBLE.*

In the study of the Semitic languages, and particularly in that of Hebrew, a great advance was made when the comparative method was introduced. There are many rare words in Hebrew, some of them words which occur once only in the Old Testament. Previously the meaning of such words was guessed from the context. Since the introduction of the comparative method, the meaning has been determined by reference to Arabic, Aramaic, Assyrian and other cognate languages. How different the result can be may be seen by comparing the translation of *Isaiah* iii, 18-23 in the Authorized Version, the Revised Version and, say, C. F. Kent's *Students' Old Testament.*

Another great advance was made when rites, ceremonies, customs and institutions referred to in the Hebrew classical writings, commonly known as the Old Testament, were compared with those of other ancient peoples, and even with those of peoples surviving in modern times and usually described indiscriminately as 'primitive.' The results of this kind of work are seen in such books as W. Robertson Smith's *Religion of the Semites,* recently enlarged very much by Dr. S. A. Cook, and J. G. Frazer's *Folk-Lore in the Old Testament.* This so-called comparative religion does much more than explain rare expressions and curious customs. Combined with comparative philology and psychology, it throws new light on the history of words. In Hebrew, Aramaic and Arabic roots, certain internal and external changes give rise to meanings which at first sight seem to have little, if any, logical connection with one another. The logical connection can hardly fail to be there. It can be found only when we know the primary and fundamental meaning of the root, and something of the psychology of the people who used it.

A third and more recent line of advance falls under the heading Anthropology. Anthropology is commonly defined as 'the science of man.' As understood by modern workers in the field, however, it may be defined more exactly as the study of man without racial, cultural or religious prejudice. In this sense, it is opening out new ways of approaching what are called sacred writings. Until recently the study of such writings was left largely in the hands of theologians, with the result that they have been translated and expounded in the terms of a stereotyped ecclesiastical language. The Hebrew classical writings, commonly known as the Old Testament, for example, have been translated and expounded by Christian theologians with one eye (the more or less blind one) on the Hebrew text, and the other on their own creed all the time. Thus words like 'angel,' 'heaven,' 'soul,' 'spirit,' 'redemption,' 'atonement,' 'salvation,' 'saviour,' are used at every possible opportunity. This is not the way to understand the Old Testament. We need to approach it in a new way, the anthropological way. If we do this, we shall find ourselves challenging continually the old translations and interpretations. And, incidentally, we shall find the study of the original text more fascinating than it has ever been before.

* *Biblical Anthropology.* Compared with and illustrated by the Folklore of Europe and the Customs of Primitive Peoples. By H. J. D. Astley, M.A., Litt. D., etc. (Humphrey Milford. 1929. 12/6 net.)

It is the merit of a new book by Dr. Astley that he seeks to study the ible, and to induce others to study it, from the anthropological point of ew. His book should do a service to scholarship by interesting students id others in a new line of research. Such subjects are dealt with as aturism or Pre-Animism, Animism in the Folk-Stories of the Old Testa- ent, Animism in Magic and Ritual, Totemism in the Old Testament, rimitive Art and Magic, Survivals of Primitive Cults, Religious Dances, ree and Pillar Worship. If much remains to be said, and if we miss ferences to a number of authors who might have helped Dr. Astley, these nissions are accounted for partly by the fact that most of the chapters in e book were originally contributions to several semi-popular journals.

Whether Dr. Astley is right in finding vestiges of totemism in the Old estament, or in using words like 'animism' and 'primitive' so freely, are w debateable questions. The evidence for totemism is very slight. Animism not the magic word it was. The need is felt for some other term [r.o.] r. A. J. Wensinck of Leiden has urged that the researches of scholars ke Robertson Smith, Wellhausen, Schwally, Doutté, Eerdmans and edersen have indicated that the literary products of the Semites contain great many reminiscences of a state of society which is familiar to those ho have studied the history of religions. This society may be said to ave moved in a pre-religious sphere (which might also be called pan- eligious), anterior to that in which personal deities came to be adored, but pen to the mysteries of the whole of surrounding nature, including the uman body—a sphere which inspired general religious awe. It implies state of mind for which scholars have not yet found an appropriate des- iption. The terms Animism, Pre-Animism, Animation, Dynamism, etc., xpress the chief phases of it; but a really satisfactory term which should mprehend all these ideas is far to seek. Again, as regards the primitive, any of the things which used to be regarded as primitive are more suit- bly regarded as marks of degradation.

In his acceptance of Higher Criticism, Dr. Astley is more thorough- oing than one would expect him to be. The Higher Criticism does not tand where it did. In view of the early Babylonian and Egyptian hymns nd psalms, it is surely very hazardous to accept the view that 'probably ot one of the Psalms is from David's hands.' The study of anthropology, ot to mention archaeology, ought to make us more cautious in accepting ne dicta of higher critics. As a matter of fact, anthropology is teaching s to treat with growing respect many of the old traditions.

MAURICE A. CANNEY.

FAITH AND REBELS.

'Testimony,' said Dr. Tennant a few years ago, 'cannot reach to divine gency.' And with that he was content to leave the question of miracles s possible but not proven, and in any case not of vital importance to hristianity. That whole position is challenged by Dr. Cairns in a book hich bears the curious title of 'The Faith that Rebels.'* The book con- ains much that is challenging to the careful reader, but all the way hrough we feel that we are moving in different spheres. Both in the ppeal to evidence and in the use of it we seem widely apart. Take one mall point which nevertheless seems to show the general drift. In men- oning the approach of the disciples of St. John the Baptist to Jesus, Dr.

* *The Faith that Rebels.* By D. S. Cairns, D.D. (S.C.M. Price 8/6.)

Cairns points to the Lucan record to show that fresh miracles were wrought to produce evidence for that occasion; the Modernist, on the other hand, would accept the simpler Marcan record, arguing from common experience that those who recount a story at a later date tend to exaggerate the dramatic details.

And from this, the Modernist is prepared to ask how much more in the Gospel record is due to the same cause. Having once arrested the attention of others by His powerful personality and its resultant effects, Christ was the centre of an expectant crowd ready to interpret anything in terms of miracle. On the side of historical evidence, therefore, the Modernist is prepared to agree to a natural interpretation of many of the miracles of our Lord, and he is encouraged to do so by the evidence of to-day that the Oriental is still ready to find a miracle in anything.

But Dr. Cairns brushes all this aside. For him, miracles are a part of the *esse* of Christianity. The records say that they happened, and so he proceeds to show why they must have happened.

The gist of his argument is that, whereas this universe is morally governed and so is purposive in its progress, man, by reason of sin and lack of faith, is rendered out of harmony with it. But Jesus, the ideal Man, was perfectly in harmony with it and perfectly at one with His Father's will. This unique perfection, by reason of its absolute harmony with the Father, shared also the Father's power. Miracles, *i.e.*, were just the inevitable expression of His perfect faith. 'These extraordinary achievements of prayer were due to His extraordinary spiritual personality, which was so entirely at one with the will of the Father that the Father was able to do extraordinary deeds of blessing, through Him. The difference between His achievements and the greatest of other men's achievements is a measure of the spiritual difference between Him and them' (p. 154).

Hence, we conclude, God will and does work through miracles when men's faith will allow Him to. And for Dr. Cairns, this means abandoning all idea of Nature as a closed system. The 'works of healing,' he says, already show an intrusion here, since the influence of mind over matter is inexplicable merely in physical terms. Hence, he argues that there is no justification for drawing a line between these and other miracles; as the theory has broken down in regard to the former, so it must give way to the latter.

But again we find ourselves arguing differently. The discoveries connected with, say, therapeutics, have revealed to science some hitherto little explored regions; to include these in its domain it may have to widen its conception of Natural Law. This process has already gone some way in such works as those of Professor McDougall; perhaps a further extension of knowledge will, in the course of time, include other of our Lord's works also within the scope of science. In that case, while we may still believe that faith works miracles, it will be found that 'miracles' also work in accordance with Natural Law. Why it should be thought a sign of greater power for God to intrude upon Nature rather than to perform His wonders through a system which is wide enough to contain them all, this Dr. Cairns does not explain.

That there are conflicting elements in our knowledge of the Universe no Modernist is rash enough to dispute. As a recent writer has remarked, 'There is a range of our experience in which we act on a determinist belief, a fixed order of nature. There is another range in which we act as free. And I fancy it is the conviction of most people that this division is

perimentally justified' (Woods: *In Pursuit of Truth*). As with Carnot's d Joule's conflicting theories of heat, we have to accept both, and hope t in time a solution will be reached. But in regard to miracles, we re-rd Dr. Cairns' theory as a hypothesis rather than a solution and, while accept some of his contentions, we disagree with many of his implica-ns. However, the book is ably written and offers stimulating reading.

J.P.H.

RELIGION AND CIVILIZATION.*

Houston Chamberlain and Spengler have set the fashion of writing oks which, to quote Gibbon on Voltaire, cast 'a keen and lively glance er the surface of history.' There is much that is fascinating in their neralisations; they stimulate the mind, and revive intellectual interest events. Two such books, though upon a rather smaller scale, lie before , one by a German and the other by an Englishman. The chapter in ofessor Freienfel's book which will perhaps interest English readers e most is an analysis of American psychology — America is taken as e type of the future, and we are asked to look forward to a general nericanization of politics, art, science, religion and humanity. The most table features of the new civilization are becoming evident beyond the lantic, and consist in the 'quantification' of life, its mechanization and ndardization, and even the 'impersonalization' of the soul.

By 'quantification' is meant the spiritual attitude for which mere size a sacred thing. *'Quantity, in America, is not a fact, as with us; it is a ue,'* declares Professor Freienfels, and the italics are not ours. Every-e in the States not only has an intense interest in figures but an onishing memory for them. The ordinary public-spirited citizen (and eryone is public-spirited in America) will reel off all the statistics of his g to the astonished listener.

'Some Americans were speaking of the advantages of their "home vns." One boasted of the tallest buildings, another of the biggest dges, a third of the deepest mines. Only one of them could think of no ord. Suddenly a saving thought occurred to him. His home town d the highest death-rate, and he promptly stated the fact.'

By 'impersonalization' of the soul is meant a certain prosaic, practical ionality, displaying itself in the standardising of thought. Hence the echanical flow of empty locutions' that does duty for conversation in erica. Stock phrases and catch-words, *i.e.*, standardised thoughts, ome the intellectual currency, and all ideas must bear the right stamp, they are rejected. Independent thought is a rarity; people's interests tre less in ideas than in 'facts,' usually either statistical or sensational. every sphere, mental as well as material, 'mass and quantity are oming decisive, and they leave no room for quality.'

Europeans, however, should not be unduly elated, nor Americans unduly et, by this castigation of trans-Atlantic vogues, for Professor Freienfels kes it clear that America is only doing what we shall be doing shortly— States, in fact, embody modern civilization *pur sang*. And the most portant problem of the future is 'whether it will be possible to give gious depth and consecration to a civilization which is in danger of oming shallow and sterile.'

* *Progress and Religion.* By Christopher Dawson. (Sheed and Ward. 10/6.) *Mysteries he Soul.* By R. Müller Freienfels. Translated by Bernard Miall. (George Allen and vin. 12/6.)

If the German writer regards our civilization as threatened by sterility owing to over-mechanisation, Mr. Christopher Dawson has misgivings no less serious, and voices the true *fin de siécle* scepticism :

'Science provides, not a moral dynamic, but an intellectual technique. It is certainly indifferent to moral considerations, and bends itself with sublime impartiality to any power which knows how to use it—like the Slave of the Ring in the *Arabian Nights,* who is equally ready "to build a town, or ruin a city, or slay a king, or dig a river, or anything else of the kind."

'We have entered on a new phase of culture—the Age of the Cinema—in which the most amazing perfection of scientific technique is being devoted to purely ephemeral objects. It seems as though a new society were arising which will acknowledge no hierarchy of values, no intellectual authority and no social or religious tradition, but which will live for the moment in a chaos of pure sensation.'

A civilization so inspired holds no promise for the future save one of disintegration. Moreover, though religion has evaporated, the religious instinct remains, and 'if this is denied its normal expression, and is driven back upon itself, it may easily become an anti-social force of explosive violence.' In every age, misgovernment and oppression have caused disorder and unrest, but 'it is a new thing that men should work and think and agitate for the complete remodelling of society according to some ideal of social perfection. It belongs to the order of religion, rather than to that of politics. It finds its only parallel in the past in movements of the most extreme religious type, like that of the Anabaptists in sixteenth century Germany and the Levellers and Fifth Monarchy Men of Puritan England.'

In short, in Lenin we get the result of a repressed religious instinct! Communism *is* a religion, with its saints, fanatics, prophets and heresiarchs, and explosive force generally. It even has its theology. Marx looked for the realisation of his hopes to 'the arm of the Lord,' *i.e.,* 'the uneluctable working of Economic Law, which human will and human effort are alike powerless to change or stay.'

Sufficient has perhaps been said to indicate the interest of these two volumes, the theme of both of which is the same, *i.e.,* the present *need* for religion. Whereas Mr. Dawson looks for a revival of traditional Christianity, Professor Freienfels considers that this is no longer possible. We need a new religion, or new religions. These may be already in our midst, though we do not perceive them.

'The pathfinders have had many forerunners. We shall scarcely find them in the ranks of the theologians and scholars, who to-day, as always, are hostile to the new religious sentiment, because it is their function to support the old.'

Of course, there is no such thing as a new religion; but at the same time a religion must always be born anew if it is to survive. That is what Nicodemus can never understand. 'How can a man be born again when he is old? Can he enter a second time into his mother's womb and be born?'

J.C.H.

SOCIAL IDEALISM.*

It is commonly agreed that the achievements of humanity in taming and harnessing the forces of Nature have not been accompanied by a commensurate degree of ethical development. 'What boots it that man should subdue Nature if he cannot subdue himself? What avails all his

* *Ethical Love.* By E. Wales Hirst, M.A., B.Sc. (George Allen and Unwin. 7/6.)

owledge if he turns it to an unsocial use?' Even apart from the next ar (which will cure a sick civilization by destroying it), the blessings of ace are less conspicuous than might have been hoped. 'In spite of the d of machinery and of discoveries in motive power, a few are rich, a w more are moderately wealthy, but the vast majority are more or less or. In our own cities delectable areas border on miles of slums.'

'Everything seems to depend ultimately,' writes Mr. Hirst, 'on the ay people live together. Accordingly, we reverse the Marxian position, d contend that the primary adjustment which Society needs to make is t to things or to material tendencies, but to other human beings or, ore strictly speaking, to its own members.' What we want is a principle union.

The principle at present in vogue would appear to be a combination force, self-interest and fear, spiritualised to some extent by a sense of nship (in those states where such a sense does exist). But the ideal cial unity 'must possess a coherence deeper than that of the kinship roup and free from its exclusiveness, an intimacy which relates men to ne another in a world-wide family.'

Mr. Hirst, in the volume before us, sets himself to discover, from an xamination of human instincts, whether such an ideal of fraternity such s he envisages is possible of fulfilment, and also whether the nature of ne universe, so far as we can understand it, is such as to sanction an ideal f this sort. Mr. Hirst's thoughtful pages are of real interest, and con- ribute ideas of considerable importance. Especially may the chapter, *Domestic Universe,* be recommended to readers who doubt whether hristian ideals of brotherhood are founded upon the nature of things.

This is a book which will well repay careful study, and will leave the eader more optimistic when he lays it down than when he took it up.

THE RIGHT STUFF.*

This booklet, the Bishop of Liverpool tells us in his Foreword, is 'an utcome of a Conference in which Bible Class Leaders compared their xperience, methods and ideals.' Of clear and definite teaching of a easonable and sensible kind, there is a considerable shortage in Sunday chools and pulpits alike, and this booklet should prove a great help in his direction. It gives ideas, illustrations, suggestive quotations, and the ne of the lessons is intelligent and humane. For example, '*Belief in the oly Spirit.* The Deistic idea of God conceives of God as apart from the orld which He has brought into existence. To the Deist, God is an xplanation rather than a friend, resulting in a theory rather than a life. Many at the present day believe in God, but their belief makes no contact ith their everyday lives. The Christian answer to this barren conception s to develop the thought of God the Holy Spirit—God in action. This ctivity is essential, for to the Christian, God is love, and love can never e content to stand aloof, but must suffer and sympathise (suffer with—ity only feels for), and must aid the objects of its love. This is shown at s highest in the Incarnation.' Again, on the symbolism and meaning of aptism:

'No sign or symbol is to be regarded as in itself and independently in he performance or use of it mechanically effective. Nor again is it a cause f what it signifies. In so far as it is an adequate symbol it provides an

* *The Lord and Giver of Life.* (Notes for Bible Class Lessons based on the Third ection of the Nicene Creed.) Edited by the Rev. C. F. H. Soulby, M.A. (Published by he Liverpool Diocesan Board of Education, Church House, Liverpool. 6d.)

occasion in and by which we are enabled to appreciate, and so receive or express the grace which it symbolises. By Baptism the child is separated and set apart from all that is associated with the world, the flesh and the devil, and introduced into the fellowship of those who are able to be the agents of the Holy Spirit in such a way as to render possible the child's re-birth in and into the realm of the Spirit. It is this that is symbolised in the Baptism, and effectively symbolised by it.'

This is compressed. But what the teacher is seeking for is ideas, facts and illustrations, not prolix verbiage. He will get what he wants if he seeks for it here : but he will require to use his brains.

UNITY AND CONTINUITY.*

In view of the widespread interest in and discussion about Re-union, we welcome a book which, while it gives the thoughtful reader a clear account of the legacy bequeathed by the mediaeval Church, stresses also the importance of the various elements valued in the religious bodies of to-day, and so points forward to a new unity rather than backward to that kind of Re-union which would involve an obsolete uniformity. 'The Making of Modern English Religion' takes too much for granted to be a text-book — it contains the substance of four lectures given to undergraduates; it is too slight to be of great use to the student of History; but as a general statement of the relation between modern religion and its mediaeval ancestry it leaves little to be desired. We could criticise many statements as inadequate and misleading, as, for example, the implication (p. 55) that Protestantism was responsible for the doctrine of an infallible book. But such things are inevitable in a book which offers only 'an historical impression of certain religious forces in modern English history.'

The unity of the mediaeval church has an undeniable fascination. It certainly managed to include many diverse elements under a common aim, and it attempted to secure that this aim should cover the whole of the many-sided activities of life. A Church which wielded authority on a magnificent scale, which enjoyed a position of magnificent prestige and which at the same time helped its members to realise the privileges of membership in a Society of which they formed a real part, was a wonderful achievement. Perhaps its unity was to some extent superficial, and it failed to maintain itself owing to inherent weaknesses, but it was a glorious failure. And when that visible unity which had for so long barely hidden some ominous cracks in the edifice was shattered by the twin forces of Nationalism and the Renaissance, each of the disintegrated parts of that Church tried to recover and retain those three factors which had made its unity so impressive. To wield authority, to enjoy a position of prestige and to offer the privileges of full Churchmanship has been the desire of each of the modern Churches; but the line of continuity is not exclusive to any of them. The writer shows that continuity cannot be regarded merely in terms of Church order. There is also a continuity of Church consciousness and a continuity of devotion, and a particular ecclesiastical body which has preserved one of these has not necessarily kept the others. Here is a profitable line for thought and discussion, and we commend this book as offering a lucid account of some factors in the witness of the Churches.

J.P.H.

* *The Making of Modern English Religion.* By B. L. Manning. (S.C.M. Price 3/6.)

PRACTICAL MYSTICISM.*

There are few words with a more incoherent meaning than the word ysticism.' It has been used to describe all kinds of experiences, whether ritual or merely sensuous, which partake in any degree of what Meredith ls 'the rapture of the forward look.' Hence, the Buddha, S. Paul, ɔtinus, Wordsworth and Tagore have all been acclaimed as 'mystics.' en a notable critic of Christian mysticism (Herrmann) published his con- sions under the mystical title of 'Communion with God.' The ordinary ident, who is accustomed to plain thinking, may well ask: 'Where shall sdom be found, and where is the place of understanding?'

A good deal of plain wisdom and clear understanding on this difficult ɔject will be found in Mr. T. M. Watt's Hastie Memorial Lectures on he Intuition of God,' which were delivered at Glasgow University in 27. The author recognises the incoherence in which his subject is in- ved, and wisely limits the scope of his inquiry to 'an intensive study the nature of the soul's fundamental apprehension of God.' By accept- ; this limitation, he is able to give us a reasoned defence of the mystical ment in the Christian Religion, and to reduce it to a practical philosophy the inner life. In his first lecture on 'Intuition and Reason,' Mr. Watt pears to accept, and to expound more fully, the principle laid down by ofessor Sorley that 'the mystical life is still a form of human life. . . en for the mystic, therefore, if his mysticism is to be a practical way of , there is the same need as for the moralist—the need of finding some nciple which will make plain the true place of value in the universe of lity' (*Moral Values and the Idea of God*, p. 182). The second and third tures are concerned to define and maintain the essentially rational nature the intuition of God, against the dissolving criticism of Professor Leuba d the too-eager friendship of Professor Otto in the interests of his ational doctrine of the Numinous. In the final lecture, Mr. Watt sus- ns his thesis with real spiritual insight and great plainness of speech. arrives at the conclusion that mystical experience 'is woven together th history, especially the History of the Passion and Resurrection of sus Christ.' The 'good things which pass man's understanding' are epared only for those who love God; they are not an unexpected gift m Heaven which comes unsought to favoured souls. Mr. Watt shows arly that the mystical experience of God is the Divine reward of patient, erior discipline and spiritual endeavour—an inward assurance, arising m that 'wise passivity' of the soul which truly waits still upon God, d meanwhile is nourished by the Christian Sacraments, and strengthened the corporate life and devotion of the Christian Church.

W. E. J. LINDFIELD.

SHORT NOTICES.

In 'The Coming of the Church' (S.C.M. 3/-), Mr. J. R. Coates treats the Church as the New Israel called to a mission of world redemption. st as Israel was in a special way elect among the nations to enlighten world, so, too, the Church is the same Israel brought into being by sus in order that she might be the agent of world salvation. There are ne very interesting and suggestive passages as, for example, that which

* *The Intuition of God.* Hastie Memorial Lectures, 1927. By the Rev. T. M. Watt, A. (Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons. 5/- net.)

deals with the use which Jesus made of the Scriptures, and points out that His reading was Historical, Critical and Devotional. But to deal with the coming of the Church in less than a hundred pages has proved too much for the writer, and the book suffers by being packed with unconnected ideas.

There were over forty papers read at the recent Liverpool Conference on International and Missionary questions, and of these seventeen are reprinted in 'The Purpose of God in the Light of the World' (S.C.M. 2/6.). Some of these, such as the addresses of Dr. Koo and Mr. C. F. Andrews, bear the burning conviction of a message straight from the mission field; others, like the excellent address on Friendship by Mr. John Macmurray appeal from the devotional side; while if Canon Raven and Mr. F. R. Barry do a little friendly sparring over amoeba and liver-fluke, they yet lead us along divergent paths to see how we can speak of 'direction' and 'purpose' in the world.

J.P.H.

FROM NATURE TO GOD.*

It is impossible in a short notice to do justice to this book, which contains a wealth of material, especially from the biological sciences. Those who find a difficulty in equating the God of Nature and the God of Religion will find here much that will help them. The God of Nature must, at any rate, take whatever credit attaches to the production of a creature like man, and though, 'were we to judge the character of God by that of the average human individual, our present inquiry would not, I am afraid, yield any very encouraging result,' yet it is rather the noblest specimens of our race who should serve as a criterion; we look 'to the world's true heroes, to the pure, the brave and the unselfish.' And if humanity has produced such flowers, what *quality* are we to attribute to the creative power which brought humanity into being? May it not be a quality such as the best human lives only faintly mirror? And 'if in the course of human history there should have come One whose life not only *verged* on perfection, but actually attained to it . . . would not such a One be indeed God's highest revelation of Himself, His one pure Image here upon earth?'

Mr. Best's last chapter is entitled *The Hereafter*. He cannot remain satisfied with an evolutionary purpose doomed to eventual defeat when our planet cools and ceases to harbour life. This would mean that 'the universe, which, during all its later evolutionary stages, has shown such manifold and unmistakable indications of purpose, is to turn out at last to have been utterly devoid of purpose as a whole. God intended nothing by it, and He is going in the far end to hand it over to destruction—to the destruction, at least, of all that has been highest and noblest in it and most nearly allied to Himself.'

If the God of Religion is a reality (and all Mr. Best's treatise marshals facts to show that He *is* such a reality), eternal life is a corollary. Mr. Best has done a piece of solid work.

* *From the Seen to the Unseen*. By John H. Best. (Longmans, Green & Co. pp. 548. 18/-.)